

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 280

RC 000 300

THE IMPACT OF TITLE I (PL 89-10) UPON THE ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS OF FOUR RURAL, ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AND CULTURALLY DEPRIVED SCHOOL DISTRICTS. FINAL REPORT.

BY- KINCHELOE, JAMES B. OGLETREE, JAMES R.
KENTUCKY UNIV., LEXINGTON, COLL. OF EDUCATION

PUB DATE

67

CONTRACT OEC-2-6-001027-0946

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$4.44 109F.

DESCRIPTORS- ADMINISTRATION, ACTIVITIES, *CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, DATA, *ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, FINANCIAL PROBLEMS, ORGANIZATION, PROJECTS, *RURAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS, USOE,

A PROJECT WAS INITIATED BY THE USOE TO DETERMINE THE IMPACT OF TITLE I ON 4 RURAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS THAT WERE CULTURALLY AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED. SPECIFICALLY, THE PROJECT ATTEMPTED TO DETERMINE THE TITLE I IMPACT ON (1) ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS, (2) PROCESSES EMPLOYED IN DETERMINING TITLE I ACTIVITIES, (3) THE ACTIVITIES, AND (4) THEIR CONSEQUENCES WITH CHILDREN. DUE TO ORGANIZATION, ADMINISTRATION, AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS, THE PROJECT WAS NEVER COMPLETED AND THE DATA PRESENTED ARE ONLY PARTIALLY COMPLETE. (JS)

ED018280

**The Impact of Title I (PL 89-10) Upon the
Administrative Operations of Four Rural, Economically
Depressed and Culturally Deprived School Districts**

**UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION CONTRACT NO.
OEC-6-001027-0946**

JAMES B. KINCHELOE

JAMES R. OGLETREE

**College of Education
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky
1967**

RC000300

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE IMPACT OF TITLE I (PL 89-10) UPON THE
ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS OF FOUR RURAL, ECONOMICALLY
DEPRESSED AND CULTURALLY DEPRIVED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

JAMES B. KINCHELOE

JAMES R. OGLETREE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

1967

THE RESEARCH REPORTED HEREIN WAS SUPPORTED BY FUNDS UNDER TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 (PUBLIC LAW 89-10), OFFICE OF EDUCATION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Section | Page |
|---|------|
| INTRODUCTION | |
| I. GENERAL PROCEDURES | 4 |
| II. THE FOUR DISTRICTS' ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND TITLE I PROGRAMS | |
| Title I Programs | 9 |
| District I | 9 |
| District II | 15 |
| District III | 20 |
| District IV | 30 |
| Summary | 38 |
| III. GENERAL PROCEDURES IN IMPLEMENTING TITLE I PROGRAMS | 40 |
| IV. EFFECTS UPON CHILDREN | |
| District I | 48 |
| District II | 52 |
| District III | 52 |
| District IV | 60 |
| V. CHANGES IN THE ADMINISTRATORS | |
| Summary | 85 |
| VI. OBSERVATIONS ON CHANGES | 87 |
| APPENDIX | |
| A - The Problems Identification Instrument | 92 |
| B - The Job Description Form | 93 |
| C - The Leadership Q-Sort | 94 |
| D - The Purposes of Education Q-Sort | 97 |
| E - Interview Guide | 100 |

LIST OF TABLES BY SECTIONS

SECTION II. THE FOUR DISTRICTS' ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND TITLE I PROGRAMS

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| I. Per Cent of Title I Budget Expended for Various Items in District I, 1965-66 and 1966-67 | 14 |
| II. Number of Personnel Employed in District I By Classification, 1965-66 and 1966-67 | 14 |
| III. Per Cent of Title I Budget Expended for Various Items in District II, 1965-66 and 1966-67 | 19 |
| IV. Number of Personnel Employed in District II By Classification, 1965-66 and 1966-67 | 20 |
| V. Per Cent of Title I Budget Expended for Various Items in District III, 1965-66 and 1966-67 | 28 |
| VI. Number of Personnel Employed in District III By Classification, 1965-66 and 1966-67 | 29 |
| VII. Per Cent of Title I Budget Expended for Various Items in District IV, 1965-66 and 1966-67 | 37 |
| VIII. Number of Personnel Employed in District IV By Classification, 1965-66 and 1966-67 | 38 |

SECTION IV. EFFECTS UPON CHILDREN

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| IX. Distribution of District I Pupils By Reading Level | 50 |
| X. Mean Grade Equivalent Gains On Reading Test By Grade Levels, District I | 50 |
| XI. Pre and Post Test Means, Physical Education Items, District I Grade 4, 1966-67 | 51 |
| XII. Eighth-Ninth Graders General Achievement Scores, District III | 54 |
| XIII. Test Data - District III Mean Gains on California Achievement Test, Grade 3-4 (1965-66 and 1966-67) | 55 |
| XIV. Test Data - District III Mean Gains on California Achievement Test, Grade 8-9 (1965-66 and 1966-67) | 56 |
| XV. County-Wide Reading Test Data - District III (Remedial Classes) | 57 |
| XVI. California Achievement and Reading Test Scores for Students in the Eighth Grade in 1966 and Ninth Grade in 1967 - District III | 59 |
| XVII. Mean I. Q. Scores and Differences in Scores on The California Achievement Test, Fall 1965 to Spring 1967 for Fourth Grade Students in District IV | 63 |

SECTION V. CHANGES IN THE ADMINISTRATORS

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| XVIII. Job Tasks as Derived from the Job Description Form for Administrators in District I | 65 |
| XIX. Job Tasks as Derived from the Job Description Form for Administrators in District II | 67 |

LIST OF TABLES BY SECTIONS - continued

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| XX. Job Tasks as Derived from the Job Description Form for Administrators in District III | 68 |
| XXI. Job Tasks as Derived from the Job Description Form for Administrators in District IV | 69 |
| XXII. Job Tasks as Derived from the Job Description Form for Administrators in All Districts | 70 |
| XXIII. Summary of Changes in Job Tasks By District | 71 |
| XXIV. Descriptive Statistics, Significance of Mean Differences, and Correlations for Structure Score of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire for Administrators in 1965 Who Remained in 1966 | 75 |
| XXV. Descriptive Statistics, Significance of Mean Differences for Structure Score of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire for Administrators in 1965 Who Remained in 1966 Against the Total Staff in 1966 | 76 |
| XXVI. Descriptive Statistics, Significance of Mean Differences, and Correlations for Consideration Score of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire for Administrators in 1965 Who Remained in 1966 | 77 |
| XXVII. Descriptive Statistics, Significance of Mean Differences, and Correlations for Consideration Score of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire for Administrators in 1965 Who Remained in 1966 Against the Total Staff in 1966 | 78 |
| XXVIII. Changes in Perceptions of Education Purposes, By District Composites as Derived From the Purposes of Education Q-Sort: Total Staff in 1965 Against Total Staff in 1966 | 80 |
| XXIX. Differences in Perceptions of Education Purposes, By District Composites, As Derived From the Purposes of Education Q-Sort: Total Staff in 1965 Against Those Who Remained in 1966 (Except Title I) | 81 |
| XXX. Differences in Perceptions of Education Purposes, By District Composites, As Derived From the Purposes of Education Q-Sort: Staff Members in 1965 Who Remained in 1966 Against Title I Staff | 82 |
| XXXI. Differences in Perceptions of Education Purposes, By District Composites, As Derived From the Purposes of Education Q-Sort: Staff From 1965 Who Remained in 1966 Against New Staff Members In 1966 (Except Title I) | 83 |
| XXXII. Differences in Perceptions of Education Purposes, By District Composites, As Derived From the Purposes of Education Q-Sort: New Administrators Against Title I Staff | 83 |

INTRODUCTION

This document is the final report for USOE Contract No. OEO-2-6-001027-0946. As will be noted below, circumstances beyond the control of the investigators resulted in a project which is less than that initially proposed.

Following submission of the final report of USOE Contract No. 5-0640 entitled Developing Procedures for the In-Service Education of School Administration (sic) in 1966, the USOE contacted the investigators expressing keen interest in capitalizing on their unique knowledge of the administrative operations of four rural, culturally deprived and economically depressed school districts. The Office's interest was in determining the impact Title I would have on: (1) the administrative operations, (2) the processes employed in determining Title I activities, (3) the activities themselves and (4) their consequences with children in these four districts for which pre-Title I data were available.

Subsequently, a proposal was submitted and tentatively approved for initiation in June, 1966. Due to considerable uncertainty and indecision in the Office of Education, final negotiations were not completed until early August. Therefore, two months were lost in the initial stages of the project thus shortening the length of the project and creating certain problems for the investigators and the participants.

Following submission of a major interim report in December, the U. S. Office requested an addendum relative to the investigators' recommendations for strengthening the effectiveness of Title I in these types

of school districts. While this request was for services beyond those outlined in the contract and while it necessitated the projection of opinions based more on impressions than objective data, the investigators complied.

As initially negotiated, the project was to have involved a two-year time period; however, federal negotiators indicated a necessity for funding separately for each fiscal year. Therefore, Article 14, Option to Renew, was inserted into the contract with a 15 day prior notice clause. Letters to the Office prior to the June 15 deadline for the option received no response. Informal telephone conversations, however, carried both a degree of assurance and uncertainty and resulted in a one-month's extension of the contract so that the Office could make its decision relative to the disposal of the contract. This continued uncertainty of renewal left the investigators no alternative but to withdraw from further negotiations and to consider July 31 as the terminal date. This decision was subsequently supported informally by an USOE official's phone call stating that funds were not available to continue this or any of the original Title I assessment projects their full two-year period. However, to date no official notification of U. S. Office action has been received.

The above analysis of the flow of events influencing the initiation, implementation and conclusion of this activity has been necessary in order to explain the incompleteness and subsequent inadequacies of this report.

The investigators spent June and most of July of this year in analyzing and validating observer-participant data collected during the year, in attempting to assist the local districts in their evaluation of the previous

year's Title I projects so that the data would be available for a second interim report to be made in November and in planning for the next year. Little attention was directed toward a final report until early July when it was decided to discontinue the contract. Consequently, while written as a final report, this document contains only partial and incomplete data. For example, only pre-investigation test data on the administrators has been collected. Post data was scheduled for next spring. The same situation exists in relation to other data.

In light of the above, then, this report is divided into the following sections:

SECTION I - GENERAL PROCEDURES

SECTION II - THE FOUR DISTRICTS' ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND
TITLE I PROGRAMS

SECTION III - GENERAL PROCEDURES IN IMPLEMENTING TITLE I PROGRAMS

SECTION IV - EFFECTS UPON CHILDREN

SECTION V - CHANGES IN THE ADMINISTRATORS

SECTION VI - OBSERVATIONS ON CHANGES

While each section is somewhat self-contained, each is extremely limited due to the drastic curtailment of the data and the brevity of time provided for the preparation of this report.

SECTION I

GENERAL PROCEDURES

The basic premise of this research was that a major effect of Title I would be its impact upon the administrators and their operational procedures in local school districts. To test this premise, four rural school districts in Eastern Kentucky were used as laboratories. These were selected primarily because the investigators had data for a two-year period on both the administrators and their operational procedures.

Several types of data were collected and treated. To determine changes in the administrators, tests were administered in August, 1966, and were to have been readministered at the close of the study so that differences in responses could be determined and interpreted. Data relative to changes in the districts' administrative operations were secured primarily from the investigators' observer-participant reports. These were supplemented by such things as: (1) interviews with each administrator and samples of teachers and students; (2) copies of the districts' Title I proposals and 1966 evaluation reports; (3) other records and reports available from both the local districts and the State Department of Education. To determine the effect of Title I upon children, copies of those test data available from each district were secured and analyzed.

Operationally, each investigator assumed responsibility for data collection in two of the four districts. Two to four days per month were spent in each district where the investigator participated in the

superintendent's staff meetings and some local faculty meetings. He interviewed administrators, teachers, parents and children. He also spent time with the Title I Director and observed the various programs - projects as they were planned and implemented. Finally, he secured those records and reports previously identified.

Treatment of the data is presented in subsequent sections of the report. It will be apparent that the data themselves are incomplete. The lack of adequate data on students and the use of only one-year's observations of the administrators preclude adequate treatment and interpretation. Therefore, the study is incomplete and does not achieve the ends for which it was designed.

SECTION II

THE FOUR DISTRICTS'
ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND TITLE I PROGRAMS

General Administrative Operations

A descriptive analysis of the administrative operations in these four districts was made in Developing Procedures for the In-Service Education of School Administration, the final report of the USOE Cooperative Research Contract No. E-026. An excerpt of that report was attached to the initial proposal for this assessment project.

The earlier data and those which have been collected subsequently indicate that the general administrative operations in all four districts may be described as follows:

1. Local orientation. With very few exceptions these administrators were characterized by Carlson's term "insiders".¹ Practically all were native to the county or had married local residents. Approximately 89 per cent had attended the county's public schools, earned degrees at nearby colleges and returned to the county to teach. Their knowledge of schools and school programs was limited to their district and others in the immediate geographic area. Their interests were equally limited as evidenced by their attending few state or national meetings and by their reading of few professional books or periodicals.

¹Richard O. Carlson, "Succession and Performance Among School Superintendents," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 6, No. 2, September, 1961, pp. 210-227.

Another factor contributing to this local orientation was the fact that most administrators maintained activities outside the school to supplement their income. In some cases these activities consumed more of the administrator's time than did his profession. This practice was traditional and fully acceptable to the community.

2. Non-formal organization. Since most administrators were "insiders" and quite familiar with local tradition, expectation and operation, the districts operated with practically no written rules, regulations, policies or procedures and where such existed they were not adhered to consistently. Responsibilities were not clearly delineated, and it was standard procedure for personnel to check frequently with the superintendent on necessary procedures. Few records were maintained systematically except those mandated by other levels of government. Communication channels were highly informal throughout the district. Evaluation, as a formal process for determining the effectiveness of the discharge of responsibilities, was almost non-existent.

3. Emphasis upon maintenance. The schools, as an organization or system, were upset primarily by public reaction to some operational action or event; therefore, the administrative staff heavily emphasized the "running of a smooth ship" and the avoidance of creating controversies. Consequently, little effort was made to deviate from safe and established patterns, for such deviation might result in public reaction and complaints. The importance of maintaining themselves in their positions was of primary importance to these administrators.

4. Emphasis upon management. The principal activity of the administrative staffs consisted of the routine management of buildings, cafeteria, school stores, parental questions and complaints, discipline and the keeping of records and making reports necessary to continue the flow of state and federal money into the districts. While a few administrators had secretarial assistance, management activities occupied a major portion of the administrators' time.

5. Little administrative attention to curriculum. With a propensity for "running a smooth ship," the administrative staffs exercised little leadership in curriculum development. Teachers were hired by the superintendent, placed in classrooms, given textbooks and little else, and then expected to teach. Few curriculum guides had been written and these were several years old and usually ignored. Teachers were largely left to their own devices so long as there were no parental or community complaints about their work. Program content, program organization and patterns of staff utilization had remained relatively static for many years.

6. Supporting personnel practices. Personnel practices were typically consistent with and supportive of that described above. Most administrators had secured and maintained their positions on the basis of who they, their friends and relatives were. This was equally true of non-professional personnel. Local residents comprised more than 88 per cent of all school employees and "who they were" was often more important than their competency.

In brief, these administrators had a genuine concern for children. Their administrative practices, however, were conditioned by local tradition, by non-formal organization, by an emphasis upon maintenance

of self in position, by an emphasis upon management activities to the neglect of curriculum development and by the use of friendship-kinship as a base for the employment of most school personnel.

Title I Programs

While the foregoing general description of administrative operations indicates a high degree of similarity among these four districts, each had its own unique individuality and certain of the unique characteristics of each district are discussed as a prelude to a description of its 1965-66 and 1966-67 Title I programs. Each district's 1965-66 Title I program is presented just as it appeared in the December interim report. This is immediately followed by a description of the 1966-67 program.

District I

The District

This district had an exceptionally strong and powerful superintendent who was deeply committed in his own way to serving the county, particularly its children. In office for more than twenty-five years, he had established himself as a member of the county's power structure and had achieved a status where his tenure in office was not greatly threatened even though he continued to work hard at remaining acceptable to the people.

Several key administrative personnel had served with the superintendent during all or most of his tenure. Others had been added over the years through a process based largely on the superintendent's assessment of: (1) their worth as school people, (2) their worth as community leaders, (3) their lines of relationships within the county and (4) their loyalty to him and what he was trying to do.

As the only district with no one-room (and only one two-room) schools, this district had made the most progress in school consolidation. It was the only district with courses of study even though they were out-dated and largely ignored. It was one of two districts that furnished each principal with some clerical assistance. It was the only one where the superintendent had no secretary himself. Finally, it was the only district where the superintendent had maintained his offices at the center of local government - the county court house.

District I's enrollment for 1965-66 was 5,500 pupils of which 3,400 came from families with yearly incomes of less than \$2,000. These students were housed in eighteen schools - eight consolidated elementary, one senior high, three twelve grade, and six small elementary schools with from two to six teachers. There was only slight change in enrollments served in the same schools in 1966-67. The relative evenness of the distribution of children from low income families was illustrated by the fact that they constituted at least half (50 per cent) of the enrollment in each school.

Administratively the district was served by nineteen persons. In the central office, the superintendent's staff included a finance officer, two directors of pupil personnel, two instructional supervisors and one director of Title I. Each school with eight or more teachers was served by a full-time principal. Of this latter group, three principals had schools with grades 1-12, eight were responsible for schools with elementary grades only and one directed a senior high school.

Title I Program, 1965-66

The title of District I's Title I program for 1965-66 was "In-Service Training Program for Teachers in Reading for Educationally Deprived Children."

Its purpose was to provide the educationally deprived children of the county an opportunity to develop and improve their reading abilities. The application for the project stated that 62 per cent of the county's enrollment was educationally deprived.

The program as set forth was comprised of four major elements each of which was described as making unique contributions to the educationally deprived child's educational progress, particularly in reading. These elements were:

1. In-service training for teachers in reading. Arrangements were made with a nearby college for its reading staff to work with the district's staff once a week on new and effective methods and materials for teaching reading.

2. Improved library facilities. Four schools had either no or inadequate space for an adequate library-materials center. This sub-project was to provide funds for the construction of such facilities as a part of the improvement in reading effort.

3. Additional instructional supplies, materials and equipment. With a low per pupil expenditure, teachers had been limited largely to a standard text. Such materials and equipment were seen as essential to the improvement of reading.

4. Additional personnel. To provide special professional personnel in remedial reading and non-professional personnel to relieve the teaching staff was justified in the proposal as contributing to the improvement of reading in this district.

The district's grant of some \$452,756 made provisions for each of the above elements. The largest amount (45 per cent) was set aside for the purchase of instructional materials and equipment. Included was a

wide selection, but the primary focus was on books, films, filmstrips, special reading materials, projectors, duplicators, tape recorders and furniture.

The next largest item of expenditure was for library construction. This took approximately 35 per cent of the total allocation. Construction of these libraries was not completed during the school year, however.

Approximately 9 per cent of the district's allocation was set aside for an in-service program for teachers. The expenditure covered pay for the extra time teachers spent in weekly training sessions and pay for consultants from a nearby college who conducted the sessions.

The additional professional and non-professional staff employed for the last four months of the school term took about 9 per cent of the Title I grant. The additional professional staff consisted of a Title I director, three special reading teachers, two elementary librarians, and one speech therapist. The additional non-professional staff included ten clerical workers, one bookkeeper and nineteen teacher aides.

Miscellaneous items of expenditure such as facilities for the director, audit, evaluation, operation and maintenance of plant and fringe benefits for personnel consumed the remaining 2 per cent of the budget.

Title I Program, 1966-67

The title of District I's Title I program for 1966-67 was "Extended Reading, Health and Physical Education." Its purpose was to provide the educationally deprived children of the county an opportunity to develop and improve their reading abilities and to develop and maintain better health.

The total grant for the district was \$486,000. The largest amount (39 per cent) was spent for additional personnel which included a Title I director, eight special reading teachers, three guidance counselors, four elementary librarians, three elementary physical education teachers, one speech therapist, one special education teacher and one instructional supervisor. The additional non-professional personnel included one book-keeper, nine clerical workers and twenty teacher aides.

The next largest item of expenditure was for lunchroom and paved playcourt construction. This consumed approximately 31 per cent of the total allocation.

Approximately 13 per cent of the district's allocation was expended for instructional materials and equipment.

Health services such as physical examinations, clothing, lunches and eyeglasses consumed approximately 5 per cent of the district's Title I budget.

A summer arts and crafts program used 4 per cent of the budget while about 1 per cent was expended on in-service activities.

The remaining 7 per cent of the budget was used for miscellaneous items such as audit, evaluation, operation and maintenance of plant and fringe benefits for personnel.

A comparison of expenditures for the two years is given in Table I on the following page.

Table II shows the number of additional personnel by various classifications employed in District I for the two years.

TABLE I
PER CENT OF TITLE I BUDGET EXPENDED FOR
VARIOUS ITEMS IN DISTRICT I, 1965-66 AND 1966-67

| Item | Per cent | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| | 1965-66 | 1966-67 |
| Instructional Materials and Equipment | 45 | 13 |
| Construction | 35 | 31 |
| In-Service Program | 9 | 1 |
| Personnel | 9 | 39 |
| Miscellaneous | 2 | 7 |
| Health Services | 0 | 5 |
| Summer Program | 0 | 4 |
| Total | 100 | 100 |

TABLE II
NUMBER OF PERSONNEL EMPLOYED IN DISTRICT I
BY CLASSIFICATION, 1965-66 AND 1966-67

| Job Classification | Number | |
|--|---------|---------|
| | 1965-66 | 1966-67 |
| Title I Director | 1 | 1 |
| Instructional Supervisor | 0 | 1 |
| Special Reading Teachers | 3 | 8 |
| Guidance Counselors | 0 | 3 |
| Elementary Librarians | 2 | 4 |
| Elementary Physical Education Teachers | 0 | 3 |
| Speech Therapist | 1 | 1 |
| Special Education Teacher | 0 | 1 |
| Bookkeeper | 1 | 1 |
| Clerks | 10 | 9 |
| Teacher Aides | 19 | 20 |
| Total | 37 | 52 |

District II

The District

Unlike the others, District II had a woman as superintendent. She had been in office for more than twenty years. This uniqueness was compounded by the fact that the assistant superintendent was also a woman. The culture of Eastern Kentucky made it difficult for a man to be subordinate to a woman, thus impairing the superintendent's role and effectiveness with her subordinates.

This district was also unique in that it had no bonded indebtedness. No school building was built until the state's annual appropriation for capital outlay had accumulated sufficiently to pay for it. Consequently, this district still had eighteen one-room and eight two-to-five-room isolated rural schools.

In her own way, the superintendent maintained firm control over the entire district in terms of employment of all personnel, assignment of personnel and controlling the budget. Others were seldom involved in these types of decisions. On other matters, the advice of the entire staff was sought and followed, when that advice was consistent with the opinion of the superintendent. As one principal said about the district's operation, "It's run by old maids."

A final uniqueness was that District II was the only district to employ an "outsider" as Title I director. He was an unusually well qualified person, holder of the Ph. D., whose health necessitated his absence for extended periods, which created an unusual number of problems in the operation of Title I.

The district enrolled some 5,700 students in 1965-66. Of these some 3,852 (or 68 per cent) were classified as being from economically deprived homes. Practically no changes occurred in these figures for the 1966-67 school year. As in District I, these children were evenly distributed throughout the county with every school having at least 50 per cent or more of its enrollment from this group.

The county operated a total of thirty-five schools - eight consolidated elementary, one senior high, eighteen with one room and eight with two-to-five rooms. Each school with eight or more teachers had a full-time principal while each small school had a head teacher in charge of its operation.

The district's central office staff for 1965-66 was composed of the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, a finance officer, two directors of pupil personnel, a visiting teacher, a lunchroom director, two instructional supervisors, a Title I director and a Title I finance officer. These, combined with the nine principals and three assistant principals, constituted a total administrative staff of twenty-three persons.

Title I Program, 1965-66

For its 3,852 deprived children, District II was initially eligible under Title I for some \$599,640. However, due to their past budgetary allocations and the imposition of the 30 per cent factor, it was finally approved for a grant of \$490,082. The district's overall Title I program for 1965-66 was "Remedial Reading Instruction and Communication Skills Project." Its major and sub purposes were all directed toward the improvement of the educational opportunities of deprived children by focusing upon

the improvement of communicative skills. To achieve this, the district's proposal was divided into five interrelated components or sub-projects. These, by types, included: (1) Instructional Improvement, (2) Social Services, (3) Research and Experimentation, (4) Staff Growth and Improvement and (5) Cultural and Recreational.

Like District I, this district placed both a top priority and its largest budgetary allotment (nearly 44 per cent of its total allocation) upon the purchase of instructional materials and equipment. Items included ranged from scotch tape and construction paper to major equipment. Primary focus, however, was placed on supplementary books, films, filmstrips, projectors of various types, special reading materials and equipment, duplicators, tape recorders and record layers.

The second largest expenditure under Title I was for a summer enrichment program which took 22 per cent of the total allotted to the district. This program operated during the summer months and was available to any child wanting to participate. Approximately 2,200, or more than a third of the district's school enrollment, participated in this experimental enrichment-recreational program. This sub-project was not part of the original proposal. Rather it was developed late in the school year as a substitute for funds for the construction of facilities which were denied by the State Department of Education.

Fifteen per cent of the allocation was used to employ additional staff. Included in the professional staff additions were: a Title I director, a Title I finance officer, a guidance counselor, one and one-half high school and eleven elementary school remedial reading teachers and an elementary librarian. The new non-professional staff included

twelve clerks, thirty-four teacher aides, twelve home-school visitors (social workers), eight health aides, a school nurse, three clerk-typists and a secretary. Personnel added under Title I filled a total of eighty-seven and one-half positions.

About 11 per cent of the total grant was spent on the in-service education of teachers. Included was pay for the extra time spent by teachers and funds for the employment of consultants. This program operated on a fixed schedule and provided intensive training in such areas as reading, child growth and development, use of instructional materials and equipment, high school programming-teaching and leadership development.

Approximately 8 per cent of the total allocation went for miscellaneous items such as operation and maintenance of plant, audit, travel and fringe benefits for added personnel.

Title I Program, 1966-67

The title of District II's Title I program for 1966-67 was "Supplemental Instruction and Services." Its purpose was to provide for the needs of the educationally deprived in the following six areas: remedial instruction, physical development, manual skills, general health, cultural experiences and social services.

The total grant for the district was \$533,000. The largest amount (40 per cent) was spent for additional personnel. The additional professional personnel consisted of a Title I director, fourteen special reading teachers, one guidance counselor, two elementary librarians, six elementary physical education teachers, two special education teachers,

and three music teachers. The additional non-professional personnel included one finance officer, fourteen clerks, fifty teacher aides, five social workers, eight nurses aides, one dentist and one nurse.

The next largest expenditure item was for a summer program which took 32 per cent of the budget. The program was planned for 1,800 children grades 1-12 and 400 pre-school children.

Approximately 17 per cent of the Title I budget was expended for the purchase of instructional materials and equipment.

The remainder of the budget (approximately 11 per cent) was used for miscellaneous items such as operation and maintenance of plant and travel and fringe benefits for personnel.

A comparison of expenditures for the two years is given in Table III following.

TABLE III
PER CENT OF TITLE I BUDGET EXPENDED FOR
VARIOUS ITEMS IN DISTRICT II, 1965-66 AND 1966-67

| Item | Per cent | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| | 1965-66 | 1966-67 |
| Instructional Materials and Equipment | 44 | 17 |
| In-Service Program | 11 | 0 |
| Personnel | 15 | 40 |
| Miscellaneous | 8 | 11 |
| Summer Program | 22 | 32 |
| Total | 100 | 100 |

Table IV, on the following page, shows the number of additional personnel employed in District II for the two years.

TABLE IV
 NUMBER OF PERSONNEL EMPLOYED IN DISTRICT II
 BY CLASSIFICATION, 1965-66 AND 1966-67

| Job Classification | Number | |
|--|---------|---------|
| | 1965-66 | 1966-67 |
| Title I Director | 1 | 1 |
| Special Reading Teachers | 12.5 | 14 |
| Guidance Counselor | 1 | 1 |
| Elementary Librarians | 1 | 2 |
| Elementary Physical Education Teachers | 0 | 6 |
| Special Education Teachers | 0 | 2 |
| Music Teachers | 0 | 3 |
| Finance Officer | 1 | 1 |
| Clerk-Secretaries | 16 | 14 |
| Teacher Aides | 34 | 50 |
| Social Workers | 12 | 5 |
| Nurses Aides | 8 | 8 |
| Dentist | 0 | 1 |
| Nurse | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 87.5 | 109 |

District III

The District

District III, unlike the other districts, had a rapid turn-over of superintendents--three in the past four years. The power structure within the county was external to the schools and used them for political

purposes. Just prior to the initiation of Title I, the district had undergone a hotly contested political campaign for the election of members to the Board of Education. The outcome was that in July, 1966, the incumbent superintendent was replaced by his assistant superintendent whose political alignment was more consistent with the victors of the election. The ousted superintendent was reassigned as a supervisor and made responsible for the administration of Title II of the ESEA.

The change of superintendents created insecurity among the other administrators. Some were reassigned, but all (except one who resigned to work elsewhere) retained administrative positions within the district. This insecurity, however, diverted the administrators' attention from their work.

The district's distinctive uniqueness, then, was not only in the control of the schools by those outside the organization or the turnover and realignment of personnel within the district, but also in the fact that the schools continued to operate about as usual. Title I was kept relatively clear of this political involvement.

During the 1965-66 school year, District III enrolled almost 6,600 children in fourteen multi-room school centers and twenty-three one- and two-room schools. The fourteen centers included two high schools, two twelve-grade schools and ten elementary schools. The one- and two-room schools contained from four to eight grades. Each school with eight or more teachers was administered by a full-time principal.

Of the 6,600 children, more than 3,533 qualified under Title I as being deprived. Of those for whom reading test scores were available, more than 48 per cent ranked below established norms for their age-grade

level in reading. Also, according to the district's data, approximately 30 per cent of these economically deprived children had I. Q.'s below 90.

More than 1,441 District III enrollees were housed in over-crowded buildings with 51 per cent of them coming from homes with less than \$2,000 annual income, and 48 per cent ranked below expectation on reading norms or on the lower half of the readiness scale for beginning students.

The district, after July 1, 1966, was administered by a total of twenty-six persons. The central office staff consisted of a superintendent, two assistant superintendents, two directors of pupil personnel, two supervisors of instruction, a director of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, a director of lunchrooms, and the Title I director and staff. This latter administrative staff was composed of a reading supervisor, a physical education supervisor and a social worker. There were also two high school, one assistant, two twelve-grade school, and eight elementary school principals.

Title I Program, 1965-66

District III's 3,533 deprived children qualified it for a Title I grant of \$516,380.84.

The district's program approved by the State Department of Education consisted of a three-pronged attack upon educational deprivation. Project #1 proposed the utilization of extra teaching personnel to reduce excessive teacher-pupil ratios in schools enrolling a large proportion of deprived children. With the more than \$50,000 for this project (approximately 10 per cent of the total grant) twelve teachers were employed, five mobile

classrooms were purchased and equipped and equipment placed in extra classrooms where these were available. Six schools and 1,370 children were affected. Fifty-one per cent of these children were from low-income families and 48 per cent were below reading level or readiness for beginning students.

Project #2 budgeted \$231,080.58 to establish, equip, staff and operate thirteen remedial reading laboratories in the consolidated school centers through the month of July. To house these laboratories, mobile classrooms were purchased and placed adjacent to six schools, while in four schools, existing classrooms were remodeled and school libraries were temporarily converted to remedial reading laboratories in two schools. The program was staffed by sixteen certified teachers (eleven from the regular staff and five unemployed), sixteen teacher aides and a reading supervisor.

Of the allocated funds, \$109,767.78 went for salaries while \$21,895.56 went for transportation and plant operation maintenance. Over \$78,000 of the allotment was used to purchase equipment and materials and to provide thirty-five days of intensive in-service training for the teachers in remedial reading. The remainder of the budget was allocated for the purchase of mobile classrooms and minor remodeling of existing facilities.

Project #3 was allocated \$233,200 for the construction of a library, cafeteria, and auxiliary rooms for the two consolidated schools in the county seat. These schools served 1,527 children, or approximately 25 per cent of the district's enrollees. While these funds were only for construction of the facilities, the proposal

indicated that these facilities were essential for adequate food, health, physical education and library services. Staffing was planned to occur after completion of the facilities.

Due to the initial plans and specifications, the district received no bid reasonably close to the available funds. Consequently, modifications in the plans had to be made and bids resubmitted.

Title I Program, 1966-67

During 1966-67, the enrollment in District III decreased from approximately 6,600 to 6,278 and the number of schools in the district was reduced from a total of thirty-seven to thirty-five. Of the students enrolled, 3,804 were from low income families. This was an increase of 271 from 1965-66. Thus, while the total enrollment in this district decreased the number of children from low-income families actually increased.

District III basically continued its initial Title I activities; however, modifications were made and services expanded. Altogether, the district's \$488,856 from Title I provided for the employment of seventy-one professional and non-professional persons and projects in: remedial reading improvement; library, food and medical services; cultural enrichment; physical fitness; guidance and social services; special education and buildings and equipment. These projects are reported below.

Project #1 was a remedial and reading improvement program designed to provide approximately four hours of special reading instruction per week to approximately 700 of the 3,200 fourth-ninth grade students during the year. Special reading laboratories had been established at each of

the fourteen school centers; therefore, a teacher and an aide were assigned to each of these. The program was directed by a reading supervisor (assisted by a part-time aide) in the ESEA office. Thus a total of fifteen professional and fifteen non-professional aides and a supervisor staffed this particular activity. Salaries, materials, transportation, facilities and fixed charges for this project consumed some \$143,335.72.

Some 3,500 students were provided library services under Project #2 of District III's Title I activities. Seven teachers had received stipends during the summer of 1966 to receive training for certification as elementary librarians. These seven persons and one already certified received \$48,420 as salaries from the total of \$52,243 allocated for this endeavor. The remainder of this allocation was used for alterations in physical facilities. Thus, District III had the services of certified librarians in each of its 11 major grade schools, on a full or part-time basis.

Since student health appeared to be below expectancy due to low-income for so many families, food services were the focus of Project #3. It was designed to serve free breakfasts and/or lunches to over 291 children. Over 50,000 meals were served at a cost of some \$12,852. Thus, every needy child in District III had access to free food during the school year.

Project #4 provided medical services as part of a total attack on health problems. The district allocated this effort some \$15,367 to employ a full time nurse and nurse's aide, to contract with doctors and dentists for services beyond the capability of the nurse and to provide transportation for the nurse. Additionally, some \$9,200 was included in a miscellaneous fund for the purchase of clothing, eye glasses, orthopedic shoes, etc.

Cultural enrichment was the focus of Project #5. A budgetary allocation of \$26,618 was made to employ two teachers (two for music and two for art) to serve the entire district, and to purchase materials, equipment and supplies. Interestingly, the teachers worked in the classrooms with the regular teachers to enrich the regular, on-going programs rather than attempting to establish separate programs. This was the first time in the district's history that such services had been available in this way.

As a part of its total health and health development effort, District III set aside \$22,035 for Project #6. These funds were used to employ a Physical Fitness director and two assistants and for the purchase of equipment approximately \$1,000. These persons served some 6,000 of the district's children; however, this staff tended to concentrate its efforts in the one and two room schools where they appeared most needed.

Project #7 expanded the guidance services available within the District. As originally planned, summer employment was given to three regular high school counselors and one person was employed full-time for the school year. Summer employment was designed to enable the high school counselors opportunity to plan and to evaluate their present programs. The full-time person was to work with the elementary schools to improve the work done by the regular classroom teachers. A total of \$11,575 was allocated for this endeavor which was designed to affect directly or indirectly some 1,500 children.

The need for a social worker to serve as an intermediary between the school and the home was deemed highly important if Title I programs were to achieve maximum results. Consequently, some \$13,286 was assigned

to Project #8. This aspect of District III's total program included the services of a full-time social worker and an aide and funds were provided for the purchase of clothing, etc., as an additional service to approximately 1,000 deprived children.

In this district local and state funds had previously been allocated for only one class of trainable children. Obviously, the need was much greater; therefore, some \$8,451 was budgeted under Project #9 to employ a special education teacher and an aide, house, feed and transport 25 students and provide materials with which they could work.

Project #10 - New Buildings, Equipment and Remodeling. This district's Project #10 recognized the drastic need for a new library, cafeteria and health center at its largest school. Funds from 1965-66 had been allocated for constructing and equipping such a unit but these proved insufficient. Some \$1,995 was allocated for minor remodeling of existing facilities to house Title I programs adequately. Additionally \$121,980 was designated for use to construct and equip the new unit and purchase nine relocatable classroom units. Some additional \$14,326 was used to purchase equipment for the new unit which would serve the elementary and high schools in the county seat. Thus, Project #10 consumed \$138,301 of the total Title I allocation.

Project #11 - Reduction of Class Size. Because of the extremely overcrowded conditions in some of the schools, Project #11 set aside some \$44,789 to employ nine teachers. This activity directly and indirectly affected approximately 1,000 children by reducing class size from a pupil teacher ratio of 43-1 to only 32-1. Those schools affected used this reduced class size as a supportive service to their reading improvement program.

TABLE V

PER CENT OF TITLE I BUDGET EXPENDED FOR VARIOUS
PROGRAMS IN DISTRICT III, 1965-66 AND 1966-67

| Item | Per cent | |
|----------------------------------|----------|---------|
| | 1965-66 | 1966-67 |
| Construction and Equipment | 45 | 28 |
| Remedial Reading | 45 | 29 |
| Reduction of Pupil-Teacher Ratio | 10 | 9 |
| Library Services | 0 | 11 |
| Food Services | 0 | 2 |
| Medical Services | 0 | 3 |
| Cultural Enrichment | 0 | 6 |
| Physical Fitness | 0 | 5 |
| Guidance Services | 0 | 2 |
| Social Services | 0 | 3 |
| Special Education | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 100 | 100 |

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF PERSONNEL EMPLOYED IN DISTRICT III
BY CLASSIFICATION, 1965-66 AND 1966-67

| Job Classification | Number | |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| | 1965-66 | 1966-67 |
| Classroom Teachers (To reduce pupil-teacher ratio) | 12 | 9 |
| Remedial Reading Teachers | 16 | 14 |
| Reading Supervisor | 1 | 1 |
| Teacher Aides | 16 | 16 |
| Title I Director | 1 | 1 |
| Librarians | 0 | 8 |
| Nurse | 0 | 1 |
| Nurse Aide | 0 | 1 |
| Dentists (Contracted Services) | 0 | 3 |
| Music Teachers | 0 | 2 |
| Art Teachers | 0 | 2 |
| Physical Fitness Director | 0 | 1 |
| Physical Fitness Assistants | 0 | 2 |
| Guidance Counselor | 0 | 1 |
| Part-Time Counselors | 0 | 3 |
| Secretary-Clerks | 0 | 3 |
| Social Worker | 0 | 1 |
| Social Worker Aide | 0 | 1 |
| Special Education Teacher | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 46 | 71 |

District IV

The District

This county was the only one of the four that was primarily agricultural. It, and the school system, were the smallest in both population and geographic area. The district was also unique in the role played by its superintendent. This person's approach to administration was a classical example of that referred to in the literature as *laissez-faire*. The avoidance of overt leadership and control from his office resulted in most unique patterns of operation. Particularly was this true in the role of the principals who operated much more autonomously than those in the other districts.

District IV was also unique in that its Title I proposals were written by a high school social studies teacher who discharged this responsibility while teaching full-time and without continuous consultation with the administrators who were responsible for supplying and justifying data and establishing priorities. The district was also the only one whose original proposal was rejected in toto by the State Department. It was approved only after its third submission.

The district's administrative staff consisted of a superintendent, a director of pupil personnel, a supervisor of instruction, a director of Title I, a high school principal, a twelve-grade school principal, an assistant principal and four principals of elementary schools.

District IV reported 3,200 children between the ages of five and seventeen as residing in its attendance area. Of these, 2,574 attended six consolidated schools, 133 attended five one-room schools and 400

were not enrolled in any school. The district's Title I grant was computed on the basis that 1,426 or 52 plus per cent, of the enrolled children qualified as economically deprived.

Only one school in the district (the county high school with an enrollment of approximately 1,000 in grades 5-12) was served by a full-time librarian. The others, including the one-room schools, shared the services of a single librarian. Most schools had little more than the basic textbooks, supplemented by few teaching aides and reference books.

The district had a dropout rate that was high even for Kentucky. The majority of these dropouts were from economically deprived homes and were reportedly achieving below grade level.

A survey conducted by the school principals revealed that over 40 per cent of the children came to school each morning without the benefit of a breakfast. Even though over 50 per cent of all enrollees were from deprived homes, only 15 per cent received free lunches.

The district's teaching staff varied more than did those in the other districts in their preparatory level. This county usually employed a much higher percentage of non-college graduates than the average district in the state.

Available standardized test scores showed that the typical child in this county was below national norms. This was especially true in reading, in reference and dictionary skills and in science.

Physically, some 1,300 of the 2,574 children enrolled could not meet the district's minimum physical education requirements while 50 per cent of those tested could not satisfy the required minimum physical fitness tests administered by the county.

Title I Program, 1965-66

The 1,426 eligible children in District IV resulted in its being granted \$221,985.41 under Title I. The proposal ultimately approved by the State Department of Education consisted of two major projects each containing sub-projects. A description of these follows.

Project #1 was designed to provide a three pronged attack on the health and physical fitness deficiencies of the district's children. Part A of the project provided \$13,600 for the employment of a nurse who worked with the County Health Department to give each child a physical examination. The nurse visited the homes of children with health problems to determine the economic status of the family. In special cases, funds were provided for glasses, hearing aids and transportation to hospitals in the area. Almost \$9,000 of this \$13,600 was used to provide free lunches for 500 of the deprived and needy children each day.

Part B of Project #1 was the purchase of \$15,064 worth of physical education equipment and \$2,880 for the employment of a physical education teacher to work with five of the district's consolidated elementary schools. The stated intent was for this teacher to aid classroom teachers in improving the normal physical education program and to teach teachers how to use the newly purchased equipment. Thus all children except 133 in the one-room schools were involved in an improved health and physical education program.

Part C of Project #1 provided a summer recreational program for all children who wanted to participate. Funds were provided to employ five teachers and two aides for two months during the summer at a cost of \$5,950. This staff was supplemented by five physical education students

from a nearby state university. Each of the six school centers operated a special program for children in its immediate vicinity two days each week. Some \$5,250 was provided to transport interested children to the county seat three days a week to associate and compete with others from all over the county. Additionally, facilities for bowling and swimming were available only at the county seat and these were made available to all children through contracts with local owners. The summer recreation program included remedial reading opportunities and made libraries available to those children who wanted to use these services during these two months.

Thus Project #1 provided a combined attack upon health, physical fitness and social problems through the services of the nurse, through food services, through the school-year physical education program and through the summer recreation program.

Project #2 was designed to expand and improve the district's library services and to provide in-service training for its staff. Some \$155,316 was allocated to the libraries and \$11,500, was assigned for in-service education.

The library services budget included more than \$79,000 for the purchase of instructional materials, audio-visual aids and equipment, books, periodicals, newspapers and standardized tests. Five librarians (all taken from classrooms where four of the five were replaced by non-degree persons) were employed thus providing each of the consolidated schools a full-time librarian. For the first time in the county's history, every child, except those in one-room schools, had access to a library staffed by a full-time person, and every teacher was supplied with supplementary teaching materials and equipment.

Another phase of the library project was the budgeting of \$54,200 for construction of libraries at two of the smaller elementary school centers. With these, each school had adequate facilities to house its library program.

Some \$11,500 of the allotment was used to compensate teachers for four days of their time for participating in in-service education activities. Arrangements were made for each teacher to observe for one day in a school with a recognized program of interest to the teacher. Three days were spent having all teachers work with consultants on linguistics, audio-visual equipment, remedial reading and mathematics.

In brief, Project #2 provided expanded library services, additional materials, equipment and facilities and in-service education.

Finally, some \$12,425 of District IV's Title I funds was used to establish, equip, and staff an office to administer the program.

Title I Program, 1966-67

During 1966-67 the enrollment in District IV decreased from 2,707 students to 2,690 and the number of schools decreased from eleven to six. Of the total enrollment 1,426 or 53 per cent were from low-income families. Consequently, District IV's Title I allocation was for \$201,215.12. These funds were ultimately used to staff an administrative office and to provide for the six major projects described below.

During the 1965-66 school year under Project #1, District IV allocated some of its Title I funds to the purchase of physical education equipment and the employment of one full-time teacher. Children participating in the program raised their PFR scores between 5-10 per cent. Recognizing

the continuing need to affect the physical aspects of its enrollment, District IV expanded this program in 1966-67 with a direct allocation of \$26,300.52 for the employment of three physical education teachers and for the purchase of additional equipment. Thus each elementary school child received instruction for 45 minutes a day while students in the high schools averaged thirty minutes per day in physical activities.

As an adjunct to Project #1, District IV's Project #2 provided funds to employ a registered nurse, contract services from the local health department and purchase glasses, hearing aids and other health devices. Of its total budget, some \$11,186 were assigned to this phase of the total health program. Each school's children were given physical examinations by the nurse and referrals were made to the local health department, local doctors and outside specialists.

Free lunches were provided under Project #3 in District IV's overall program on the health and physical education needs of its children. During the school year, over 700 children (26 per cent of the total enrollment) were provided free lunches daily. These lunches were planned under the supervision of a lunchroom supervisor who worked closely with lunchroom personnel in each school. For this program some \$31,387 was expended over the nine months period.

Project #4 was a carry over from 1965-66's remedial reading program. It was expanded so that a total of 237 children received special treatment to overcome deficiencies in this learning-skill area. A total of \$19,727 was allocated from Title I to employ two remedial reading teachers and to purchase additional equipment. Local funds were used to employ a third teacher so that each of these three teachers served and worked with children in two separate schools.

During 1965-66, considerable library materials and equipment was purchased and trained librarians employed. During 1966-67, some \$82,717 from Title I was allocated for this activity under Project #5. Included were salaries for five fully certified librarians, two library aides and one part-time clerk. Additional equipment-materials were budgeted for \$21,754 from the total. This placed full-time librarians in each of District IV's schools and up-dated the libraries by a considerable degree.

During 1966-67, the summer program was curtailed considerably. The rental swimming pool and bowling alley, for example, were eliminated. Project #6's \$26,898 budget for this activity provided services from four remedial reading teachers, food services and transportation for 337 students, two librarians and two additional physical education instructors. Additionally, services from all twelve months personnel identified in other projects were available during the two summer months.

Thus, District IV's Title I activities during 1966-67 were basically only extensions of those proposed and initiated during the previous year. With the exceptions of summer recreational activities and the purchase of library materials and remodeling of facilities for such libraries, the projects of 1965-66 were expanded.

Table VII, on the following page, shows the expenditure for the two years.

Table VIII gives the number of additional personnel and their classification for the two years.

TABLE VII
 PER CENT OF TITLE I BUDGET EXPENDED FOR
 VARIOUS ITEMS IN DISTRICT IV, 1965-66 AND 1966-67

| Item | Per cent | |
|------------------------|----------|---------|
| | 1965-66 | 1966-67 |
| Health Services | 2 | 5 |
| Food Services | 4 | 16 |
| Physical Education | 8 | 15 |
| Summer Recreation | 5 | 13 |
| Library Services | 46 | 41 |
| Library Construction | 24 | 0 |
| In-Service Education | 5 | 0 |
| Administrative Offices | 6 | 0 |
| Remedial Reading | 0 | 10 |
| Total | 100 | 100 |

TABLE VIII
 NUMBER OF PERSONNEL EMPLOYED IN DISTRICT IV
 BY CLASSIFICATION 1965-66 AND 1966-67

| Job Classification | Number | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | 1965-66 | 1966-67 |
| Director | 1 | 1 |
| Nurse | 1 | 1 |
| Physical Education Teachers | 3 | 3 |
| Part-Time Physical Education Teachers | 2 | 2 |
| Librarians | 5 | 4 |
| Part-Time Librarians | 1 | 2 |
| Clerical Assistants | 3 | 3 |
| Remedial Reading Teachers | 0 | 2 |
| Part-Time Remedial Reading Teachers | 0 | 4 |
| Lunchroom Supervisor | 0 | 1 |
| Aides | 13 | |
| Part-Time Aides | 3 | |
| Total | 34 | 23 |

Summary

The administrative operations in these four school districts were quite similar in many respects and the Title I programs developed over the two years were very much alike. Each district planned and implemented Title I programs which the first year had large expenditures for in-service education and materials and equipment. Three of the districts' first year programs also made large investments in construction of facilities. In all

of the districts, the second year Title I programs had reduced expenditures for in-service education for staff, materials and equipment and construction of facilities. Each expanded its programs into new areas and increased the expenditures for personnel to man these programs.

SECTION III

GENERAL PROCEDURES IN PLANNING
AND IMPLEMENTING TITLE I PROGRAMS

The four school districts participating in this study did not customarily keep formal records of meetings or of decisions made. It was difficult, therefore, to collect systematic data regarding the processes involved in developing and initiating their Title I programs. The following description is based on the investigators' discussions with the administrative staffs, on observations and on fragmentary records which were available.

Planning Procedures

The procedures used in developing and implementing the Title I programs in the four districts were very similar. During the last two school months of 1964-65 (April and May) discussions were initiated by the superintendent among principals and some teachers relative to the educational needs of their schools and of the school district. This in itself was somewhat unique, since resources had never before been available to make such a consideration necessary. In all four districts, principals were requested to work with their teaching staffs to produce lists of materials, programs and personnel most needed to improve the quality of educational opportunities in their individual schools. In most cases, such lists were quite modest in terms of the money necessary to finance them, and in no case were the requests very imaginative as educational innovations.

From the lists submitted by the schools, priorities of needs were established for each school district. Central office administrators and school principals participated in the determination of priorities, but in all districts (including District IV) the superintendent played a dominant role.

During this period of time (April and May, 1965) each district also collected some data relative to the number of children in each school who came from homes with incomes of less than \$2,000 annually and the number of children who were educationally deprived. Each system experienced considerable difficulty in establishing the number of educationally deprived because of inadequate records and unreliable test data. Therefore, most districts relied heavily on the judgments of teachers.

There was a considerable delay during the summer and into the Fall of 1965, waiting for specific guidelines for Title I projects to come from the state educational authorities. Because no information was disseminated locally from the central office to the schools regarding the status of Title I during this period of delay, reports circulated in the schools that the proposals had been written and there was considerable speculation that various school requests had been ignored.

When the state guidelines became available in November, 1965, each system assigned a person the responsibility of developing the written proposal. District I gave this job to an elementary principal who was relieved of his principalship responsibilities and provided the assistance of a supervisor of instruction. District II hired a person from outside its organization to develop the proposal while District III

assigned the task to an instructional supervisor. District IV assigned a high school social studies teacher, with no relief from his teaching responsibilities, to the task of writing its proposal.

Because all four school districts had large distributions of educationally deprived children in each school, the proposals were made on a district-wide basis. Because of the writers' inexperience with proposals and with evaluation, the stated purposes of each proposal were very vague and general.

No attempt was made to communicate with personnel in the schools regarding specific proposals as they were developed. As soon as the proposals were completed, approved by the superintendent and discussed with the necessary community agencies, they were submitted to the state educational authorities.

The proposals of District I and District III were approved by the state educational authorities with very minor modifications. School District II requested a large portion of its allocation for construction of buildings which was not approved. Consequently, this district's proposal was modified to include a summer school program in order to use the money originally requested for building construction. The proposal of District IV was rejected twice by the state educational authorities resulting in a long delay in their being able to implement their program.

Planning for the initiation of Title I programs in 1965-66 required that each district assess its educational needs and assign some priorities. In each school district the first year's efforts could not attempt to meet all of their needs. Consequently, the planning for the second year, 1966-67, consisted mainly of attempting to develop programs to meet those needs unmet

by the program the first year. Thus, the second-year programs were planned on the basis of the previous year's assessment and there was a minimum of staff participation.

Implementing Procedures

As proposals were approved by the state educational authorities, the districts moved immediately into implementation. In each case the person who had been assigned the responsibility of developing the proposal was employed as director of Title I activities for the district and in January and February, 1966, the programs were activated.

The first task to which the districts turned their attention was that of staffing the positions approved in the programs. There was no evidence that any effort was made to recruit personnel outside the boundaries of the school district. Nor was there evidence, with minor exceptions, that qualifications of personnel were a major consideration.

The common professional staffing pattern was to transfer classroom teachers to the newly created positions and to replace them with local residents for whom there had not been positions in the schools earlier. In most instances the personnel reassigned or employed had no special training for the position they filled. District I, alone among the four districts, recognized this and got a commitment from all such personnel to take special training during the summer months.

The non-professional personnel were, in the main, selected from among the unemployed. No educational qualifications were established, although most were high school graduates, except in District I. In that district high school graduation was established as a requirement for all

non-professional employees and a proficiency test in typing was given all applicants for clerical positions. Additionally, each secretary was required to participate in an in-service training program for the remainder of the school year.

The superintendent played a dominant role in the employment of all personnel. In some instances the principal was consulted about the employment of personnel in his school, but in most instances he was not. Some principals have remarked that they regret that "politics is necessary in these matters."

The personnel employed in the Title I programs were assigned to schools under the supervision of the principals. Two of the districts-- I and II developed job descriptions for the non-professional personnel, but in only District I were they used. In District II the decision was made not to use job descriptions because of the belief that if personnel were not assigned a particular job and were asked to do that job, the personnel would resent it. Consequently, in all except District I, the principal of the schools had to exercise close supervision of the non-professional personnel. Scheduling the activities of the Title I personnel also became a major job of the principals.

Considerable delay was experienced in all districts in placing and filling orders for the volume of supplies and equipment made possible by Title I. Consequently, much of the materials did not arrive at the schools in time for use during the 1965-66 school year. Since no channels of communication were established between the business office and the schools on this matter, principals and teachers were often irritated by not having expected materials.

Supply and equipment orders were usually developed by the Title I director from lists made up in individual schools. Since these lists were frequently meager, schools were given many materials their personnel did not know how to use. Part of the in-service programs in all districts was devoted to instruction in the effective use of these previously unavailable instructional materials.

There were no significant changes in methods of implementation in any of the four districts from the first year to the second year of Title I programs. Practically all of the personnel employed initially were continued in the same positions the second year. Additional positions created by new or expanded programs were filled from the ranks of the unemployed or transferred from positions within the school system. All of these employees were local residents.

Evaluation Procedures

All of the proposals submitted from the four districts contained statements of plans for continuous evaluation. However, there is slight evidence that any formal evaluation was carried on by school district personnel. There was informal questioning on the effectiveness of various aspects of the programs but all except District IV hired outside consultants to do the formal evaluation required by the state educational authorities.

Due to the lateness in the school year of getting Title I projects started and to the absence of valid test data from previous years, the evaluations the first year consisted mainly of gathering and analyzing opinions of persons related to the programs.

Serious attempts were made by three of the four systems to start comprehensive objective testing programs. However, the lack of clear directions and procedures on administration, scoring and compilation of scores have made the collection of valid data extremely difficult. Compared to the uniform and standardized procedures of many urban school systems, the lack of such procedures in these systems is almost unbelievable.

SECTION IV

EFFECTS UPON CHILDREN

The scope of this study's attempt to determine the effect of Title I programs on children was purposefully limited to treatment of those test data available in each district. No effort was made by the investigators to influence the production of more adequate test data as a part of this study. Decisions relative to testing were left entirely in the hands of the local district administrators. Furthermore, the investigators made no major issue of requesting those data; however, when asked, each district willingly provided the data.

Unfortunately, this report is being written before any of the districts have completed their assessment of their 1966-67 Title I programs. These data, like those for 1965-66 were to be made available to the investigators in September.

Any attempt to evaluate the effects of programs such as those previously described is to say the least both complex and difficult. Each district developed its own assessment program using their limited test data where appropriate and relying heavily on pupil-teacher-parent opinionnaire responses. Without exception, the results of such opinionnaires revealed a high level of satisfaction and approval of those programs initiated through Title I. Each program was thus assessed as producing results with children beyond that normally expected in each district. Therefore, these may be summarized by saying that data secured through the use of teacher-student-parent responses to opinionnaires clearly indicate that each Title I program had a positive effect upon the students involved.

Positive reactions to such programs are not unexpected. However, when the investigators turned their attention to more objective data such as achievement test scores, they found much to be desired in terms of the data available and their reliability. In no district were complete data found which were not suspect. Teacher-administration and scoring, where checked, produced results which caused much of the data to be of highly questionable reliability. Subsequently, little data were available in which the investigators could place full confidence. Therefore, below is set forth a general introduction to each district's assessment program. This is followed by a display of those data in which the investigators have the most confidence. They are displayed only because they are the best available.

District I

As with the other district, determination of the effects upon children of a program of such size as Title I in this district is difficult. The full impact of such programs take time, is not immediately evident and too little time has elapsed for an adequate assessment to occur. However, one type of evaluation was based on comments of students and teachers on the assumption that programs which seemed worthwhile and pleased students and teachers would result in more effective learning. The comments of students revealed that they were very pleased to have more classroom materials and that they thought school was a more pleasant and worthwhile place since Title I programs came into existence. The teachers expressed a feeling that for the first time in their teaching careers they had enough classroom

materials, equipment and supporting services to do an adequate job. Many expressed the attitude that they could be expected to produce more effective results because of Title I programs.

Another type of evaluation was made on the basis of objective test scores. The data available from the schools indicate that the median I. Q. of their students is about 90. Approximately 30 per cent of these students scored below 80 on I. Q. tests compared with approximately 11 per cent nationally. At the other end of the scale, only about 4 per cent of the students in this district had I. Q.'s of 120 or above as compared with 11 per cent nationally. Although there were small variations from this general pattern from grade to grade, it was quite evident that the schools in this district are faced with concentrations of children who have below average ability to do school tasks when compared with children over the nation.

School achievement of these children was, as could be expected, considerably below national norms. Table IX, on the following page, demonstrates this lag. Apparently the gap between these children's achievement scores on reading and those for other children over the county generally widens rapidly as they move up the educational ladder. As shown in Table IX, for example, 58 per cent of the fourth grade pupils scored at or below grade level while 69 per cent of the eighth grade pupils scored similarly.

TABLE IX
DISTRIBUTION OF DISTRICT I PUPILS BY READING LEVEL

| Grade | Number of Students | Per cent of Children Scoring According to National Norms | | | |
|-------|--------------------|--|---------------|---------------|------------------|
| | | Below 25%ile | 50%ile 26%ile | 75%ile 51%ile | 76%ile and above |
| 4 | 273 | 23 | 35 | 23 | 19 |
| 5 | 228 | 34 | 40 | 15 | 11 |
| 6 | 330 | 48 | 35 | 16 | 1 |
| 7 | 300 | 46 | 26 | 23 | 5 |
| 8 | 330 | 43 | 21 | 19 | 12 |

It was in this setting of below average abilities and retarded achievement that the Title I programs operated. A major emphasis of these programs in this district was on remedial reading. To assess the progress made in this program, the gain in reading scores from September to May, made by remedial pupils was compared with the same number of non-remedial pupils selected at random in the county. The results are shown in Table X.

TABLE X
MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT GAINS ON READING TEST BY
GRADE LEVELS DISTRICT I

| Grade | Remedial Pupils | | Non-Remedial Pupils | |
|-------|-----------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|
| | N | Reading Gain | N | Reading Gain |
| 3 | 22 | 1.1 | 22 | 1.0 |
| 4 | 41 | 1.4 | 41 | 1.0 |
| 5 | 31 | .9 | 31 | .6 |
| 6 | 27 | .8 | 27 | .6 |
| 7 | 22 | .5 | 22 | .6 |
| 8 | 15 | .7 | 15 | .6 |

Although the differences in gain between the remedial and non-remedial group are not significant, at all grade levels but one the greater gain was made by the remedial group.

Another major emphasis of the Title I program for 1966-67 in District I was in physical education. Tests were given by the teachers in September and again in May. Comparison of the pre-test and post-test means reveal significant gains at all grade levels in practically all items tested. Results typical of the general pattern of gains were found at the fourth grade level as is shown in Table XI.

TABLE XI
PRE AND POST TEST MEANS, PHYSICAL EDUCATION ITEMS,
DISTRICT I GRADE 4, 1966-67

| Items | Pre-test Means | | Post-test Means | | Mean Gains | |
|---------------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|---------|------------|---------|
| | Males | Females | Males | Females | Males | Females |
| Height | 53.1 | 52.4 | 56.2 | 54.3 | 3.1 in | 1.9 in |
| Weight | 71.6 | 60.4 | 79.1 | 68.4 | 7.1 lbs | 8.0 lbs |
| Sit Ups | 24.8 | 20.6 | 53.9 | 38.3 | 29.1 | 17.7 |
| Shuttle Run | 11.7 | 12.8 | 10.1 | 11.1 | 1.6 sec | 1.7 sec |
| Standing Broad Jump | 49.8 | 44.7 | 58.4 | 52.2 | 7.6 in | 7.5 in |
| 50 Yard Run | 9.6 | 10.6 | 8.3 | 9.1 | 1.3 sec | 1.5 sec |
| Softball Throw | 74.9 | 42.3 | 81.7 | 47.5 | 6.8 ft | 5.2 ft |

The question arises regarding how much of the gains can be accounted for by maturation. Comparison of these scores with national norms reveals that significant gains were made. Boys in grade four improved in sit ups from poor to midway between good and excellent; in standing broad jump from

poor to satisfactory; in 50 yard run from very poor to satisfactory; in softball throw from very poor to poor. Girls made comparable gains.

In brief, both the results from a series of opinionnaires and the above test data would seem to indicate that Title I programs are having positive effects upon the students in this District - effects somewhat beyond those reasonably expected.

District II

Like District I, this school system's Title I assessment efforts were heavily reliant upon teacher-pupil-parent responses to questionnaires and/or opinionnaires. Overwhelmingly, these responses were positive in their support of all Title I programs.

Test data in this district were only partially available and those accessible appeared so contaminated by teachers' administration - scoring and/or reporting procedures that none are here reported. There is no reason to assume that the ability and achievement of these children differ drastically from their counterparts in the other districts included in the study.

District III

As was the case in the other districts, District III in both 1966 and 1967 relied heavily upon personal opinions and reactions as a base for assessing its Title I programs. Also as in other districts, the responses were overwhelmingly positive and supportive of those activities initiated and implemented under the funds made available by the ESEA. The district's usable test data were also extremely limited.

While its testing program had been developed by a county-wide Guidance Committee, its grade-level sequence of testing was such that data on other than last year's third and this year's fourth grades along with that for the eighth-ninth grade combination were not usable this year. The program was also characterized by its lack of standard policy and procedures. Tests were administered at the convenience of the individual school principal and staff thus producing data with different time bases. Operationally, tests in the elementary school were administered by an individual teacher to his own class with no supervision or assistance. This, accompanied by the use of radically different procedures in the high schools, meant that children took these tests under varying physical and psychological conditions. Therefore, most of the data are suspect and are presented here only because they were all that were available and because they will be used by the district as bench-mark data for next year's assessment.

As indicated above, general achievement scores on the California Achievement Test (1963 norms) were available for most of this year's fourth grade for both 1965-66 and 1966-67. A similar set of scores was available for this year's ninth grade students. One school, however, could not provide these data because they had been "lost." A second school apparently had not administered the test one year. Therefore, the following data do not represent all fourth and ninth grade students.

Fourth grade students in 1966-67 apparently gained 1.03 years in one year on their general achievement, and .996 of a year's progress was made in their reading. Therefore, it would seem that this grade-level group of students made normal progress between the Springs of 1966 and 1967.

Such progress, however, was not achieved by the ninth grade according to their reported test data. The average gain recorded in general achievement for the year was only 3.7 months. The gain in reading was equally low - only 4 months - for the same time span. The year's general achievement gains by school ranged from zero (0) to only 7.9 months. Gains in reading were equally low - ranging from a low of .2 to .71 of a year. On neither general achievement nor reading did any single ninth grade class progress a full year beyond their eighth grade scores.

The data also revealed that as eighth graders these students' mean scores were only .5 of a year below the national norms. When retested as ninth graders in the spring of 1967, their mean score had dropped to one year - one month below these norms. This would apparently imply that these students were dropping further and further behind their counterparts in other sections of the country.

An analysis of individual students' scores for these two years indicated that many of them actually regressed rather than progressed. Some who scored highest in the eighth grade scored the same or lower as ninth graders. The following table displays this phenomenon:

TABLE XII
EIGHTH-NINTH GRADERS GENERAL ACHIEVEMENT SCORES,
DISTRICT III

| School | No. | Regressed or Same | Progressed, but less than 1 yr. | Progressed 1 yr. or more |
|--------|-----|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| L | 85 | 12 (14%) | 52 (61%) | 21 (25%) |
| M | 19 | 1 (5%) | 9 (47.5%) | 9 (47.5%) |
| N | 73 | 28 (39%) | 30 (41%) | 15 (20%) |
| O | 211 | 105 (50%) | 87 (41%) | 19 (9%) |
| TOTALS | 388 | 146 (38%) | 178 (46%) | 64 (16%) |

As evident, when only 16 per cent of 388 students advance a year or more on the California Achievement Test's norms, the district has cause for alarm, for its children are either not being provided adequate programs or its testing procedures are highly contaminating the data. In this case, the school principals blamed the latter. While they acknowledged a broad gap between the feeder and high schools (between grades eight and nine), they concluded that in the elementary schools (grade 8) individual teachers were probably assisting their students beyond the limits expected during the testing period. It was also concluded that high schools, especially School O, was setting conditions much too rigidly and too physically uncomfortable for students to respond to the test adequately.

Following are displayed brief comparisons of mean grade placements by schools for the years 1965-66 (first year of ESEA) and 1966-67 (second year of ESEA).

TABLE XIII
TEST DATA - DISTRICT III
MEAN GAINS ON CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST, GRADE 3-4
(1965-66 AND 1966-67)

| School | N | Mean General Achievement Gain During 1 Yr. | Mean Reading Gain During 1 Yr. |
|-------------|----|---|-----------------------------------|
| A | 16 | 1.00 | 1.08 |
| B | 35 | 1.36 | 1.00 |
| C | 34 | 1.10 | .80 |
| E | 53 | 1.17 | 1.17 |
| F | 21 | .75 | .75 |
| G | 12 | 1.00 | 1.07 |
| H | 36 | 1.18 | 1.09 |
| I | 27 | .32 | .91 |
| J | 59 | .90 | 1.00 |
| MEAN | | 1.03 | .996 |

The preceding data indicate that progress made by District III's children in the fourth grade is normal. The range of .75 of a year to 1.36 of a year accompanied by more than a year's progress in four schools and less than a year's advance in three schools is about as expected. Scores on reading also indicate expected progress. Therefore, in general these children appear to be achieving normally. However, more adequate data might indicate such not to be the case.

The mean California Achievement Test scores for the ninth grade appear below in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV
TEST DATA - DISTRICT III
MEAN GAINS ON CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST,
GRADE 8-9 (1965-66 AND 1966-67)

| School | N | Mean General Achievement Gain During 1 Yr. | Mean Reading Gain During 1 Yr. |
|-------------|-----|---|-----------------------------------|
| L | 85 | .50 | |
| M | 19 | .79 | .71 |
| N | 73 | .20 | .30 |
| O | 211 | 0 | .20 |
| MEAN | | .37 | .40 |

As evident earlier, these children progressed far less than normally expected between the end of the eighth and ninth grades. The 211 in School "O" indicate no progress in general achievement and only 2 months growth in reading.

More adequate data were available on children in grades 4-9 participating in the Title I Remedial Reading Program. As part of the district's evaluation of this program, the Developmental Reading and Feabody Picture Vocabulary Tests were administered to grades 4-8 in November, 1966, and again in April, 1967. These data are summarized and appear in the following tables.

TABLE XV
 COUNTY-WIDE READING TEST DATA - DISTRICT III
 (Remedial Classes)

| Pre-Test, 11-66 | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|------|----------------|-------|
| GRADE | N | MDN. | RANGE LO-HI | DIFF. |
| 4 | 108 | 3.6 | 1.6 - 5.6 | 4.0 |
| 5 | 122 | 4.0 | 2.2 - 5.4 | 3.2 |
| 6 | 91 | 4.2 | 1.5 - 6.0 | 4.5 |
| 7 | 21 | 5.7 | 3.4 - 8.1 | 4.7 |
| 8 | 20 | 6.2 | 3.3 - 9.3 | 5.0 |

| Post-Test, 4-67 | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|------|----------------|-------|
| GRADE | N | MDN. | RANGE LO-HI | DIFF. |
| 4 | 108 | 4.3 | 2.1 - 6.0 | 3.9 |
| 5 | 122 | 4.6 | 2.6 - 6.9 | 4.3 |
| 6 | 91 | 4.8 | 2.8 - 7.2 | 4.4 |
| 7 | 21 | 6.0 | 4.1 - 10.7 | 6.6 |
| 8 | 20 | 7.4 | 4.7 - 11.6 | 6.8 |

| GRADE | N | MEAN I.Q. | TIME BET. TESTS | DIFF. MEANS PRE-POST. | PROG. PROJ. 1 YR. |
|-------|-----|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 4 | 108 | 87 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.00 |
| 5 | 122 | 85 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.00 |
| 6 | 91 | 86 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.00 |
| 7 | 21 | 90 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.50 |
| 8 | 20 | 93 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 2.50 |

The preceding table summarizes the data for all students in grades 4-8 who participated in District III's remedial reading program. These students had a mean I. Q. of 88 and during the time between testings apparently advanced their scores more than expected. All grades showed projected gains of one or more years with the eighth grade's projected gain reaching 2.5 years. This possibly means that the Title I remedial reading program in this district is surpassing expectations.

When the ninth grade students' test scores were analyzed, they again revealed less than normal progress as indicated in the following tables.

These data indicate that the range of differences between the two administrations of the tests remained relatively stable. The rate of progress for these students was much less than normal, thus creating several problems to which the district might address itself.

The differences in the mean reading scores was only 0.6 of a year. These data tend to support those earlier presented relative to the ninth graders general achievement. Therefore, it would seem that children in this district achieve less well when they transfer into the consolidated high schools. Equally it would seem that the remedial program, while successful in the elementary school is not so effective in the high schools.

TABLE XVI

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT AND READING TEST SCORES FOR STUDENTS
IN THE EIGHTH GRADE IN 1966 AND NINTH GRADE IN 1967
DISTRICT III

General Achievement Test

| Grade 8, April, 1966 | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------|------|------|----------------|-------|
| N | GRADE | MDN. | MEAN | RANGE LO-HI | DIFF. |
| 122 | 8.8 | 7.8 | 7.7 | 5.5 -10.1 | 4.6 |

| Grade 9, April, 1966 | | | | | |
|----------------------|------|------|----------------|-------|--|
| GRADE | MDN. | MEAN | RANGE LO-HI | DIFF. | |
| 9.8 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 5.5 -10.0 | 5.5 | |

| TIME BET. TESTS | DIFF. MEANS | PROG. PROJ. 1 YR. |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.50 |

Reading Test

| Grade 8, April, 1966 | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------|------|------|----------------|-------|
| N | GRADE | MDN. | MEAN | RANGE LO-HI | DIFF. |
| 122 | 8.8 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 4.2 -10.0 | 5.8 |

| Grade 9, April, 1967 | | | | | |
|----------------------|------|------|----------------|-------|--|
| GRADE | MDN. | MEAN | RANGE LO-HI | DIFF. | |
| 9.8 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 4.9 -11.2 | 6.3 | |

| TIME BET. TESTS | DIFF. MEANS | PROG. PROJ. 1 YR. |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.60 |

District IV

District IV resorted to a less formal and less intensive effort to assess its Title I programs. Some questionnaires were used and the results generally tabulated. However, the major effort was to secure data necessary to comply with the State Department of Education's regulations. These data were reported and the assessment aspect of Title I dismissed.

However, during 1966-67 interest was shown when the investigator inquired again about test data and plans were discussed for utilizing such data for the 1967-68 school year.

The test data available but unused in District IV was voluminous. The district had for some time been included in pilot testing programs, test validation programs and something of a program of their own. From all these, however, it was impossible to secure enough sequential data to make an adequate analysis of student progress since the implementation of Title I programs.

Those data available appeared to suffer from a high level of contamination. Administered by individual teachers with no assistance or supervision and at various times (even within a school) the test scores were reported to the central office in a variety of forms. Some were recorded on the test publisher's prepared forms. Some were scrawled on the backs of previously used paper. One set was recorded crudely on a piece of cardboard. Once these were received by the central office, the general supervisor examined them informally and filed them away. There was no evidence that teachers, principals or central office personnel

made any use of the data. To illustrate, the superintendent was shocked when he learned that on the California Test of Mental Maturity over 75 per cent of the district's tested children had I. Q.'s of 98 or less and that over 45 per cent were reported to have I. Q.'s less than 60.

In light of the above, the data which follow were salvaged from the inconsistent mass available and are included only as representative of the best available in this district in the spring of 1967.

The California Achievement Test had been administered to the fourth, eighth and eleventh grades in the fall of 1965. It had also been given to all fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth grade students in April, 1967. Thus, the only group (grade) on which two sets of data were available were those children who had been in the fourth grade during the 1965-66 school year. Scores from the Fall of 1966 administration of the California Test of Mental Maturity were also available for these same students. The interval between the two administrations of the achievement test was 1.6 years and approximated the same period in which Title I programs had been operative in the county.

In reading, these fourth grade students in 1965 had a mean grade placement of 3.6 or .7 of a year below the national norms for this test. In the Spring of 1967, this same group recorded a mean grade placement of 5.0 or .7 of a year below the norms. Thus during the 1.6 intervening years, they maintained the lag present in the fourth grade.

In arithmetic, these students had a mean grade placement in the Fall of 1965 of 4.1 or only .2 of a year below the norm. After the second test, their mean placement was 5.5 or still .2 of a year below expectancy.

The mean grade placement for language moved from 3.9 or .4 of a year below the norm, up to 5.1 or .6 of a year below the norm. Thus these students fell further behind in this area of the test.

The overall trend seems to be that each year, this group slips farther behind their counterparts in other sections of the country, for on the whole they were progressing at the rate of only .8 of a year for each year of attendance.

As indicated earlier, District IV's children scored low on the California Test of Mental Maturity. For example, the mean, I. Q. for all fourth grade students was 87. For all students in grades 4-8 the mean I. Q. was 89.

Table XVII displays the basic data from which the above discussion emanated.

TABLE XVII

MEAN I. Q. SCORES AND DIFFERENCES IN SCORES ON
THE CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST, FALL 1965 TO SPRING 1967
FOR FOURTH GRADE STUDENTS IN DISTRICT IV

| School | Mean I.Q. | N | READING G. P. | | Growth Rate Per Year |
|----------------|--------------|----|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Nov. '65 Below Norm | Apr. '67 Below Norm | |
| A | 87.7 | 20 | 4.1 - .2 | 4.7 -1.0 | .37 |
| B | 82.0 | 37 | 3.2 -1.1 | 4.7 -1.0 | .94 |
| C | 90.9 | 42 | 3.3 -1.0 | 5.0 - .7 | 1.06 |
| D | 90.1 | 71 | 3.9 - .4 | 5.5 - .2 | 1.00 |
| E | 85.2 | 24 | 3.7 - .6 | 5.1 - .6 | .87 |
| AVERAGE | 86.7 | | 3.6 - .7 | 5.0 - .7 | .85 |

| School | Mean I.Q. | N | ARITHMETIC G. P. | | Growth Rate Per Year |
|----------------|--------------|----|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Nov. '65 Below Norm | Apr. '67 Below Norm | |
| A | 87.7 | 20 | 4.4 + .1 | 5.5 - .2 | .68 |
| B | 82.0 | 37 | 4.0 - .3 | 5.1 - .6 | .68 |
| C | 90.9 | 42 | 3.8 - .5 | 5.5 - .2 | 1.06 |
| D | 90.1 | 71 | 3.9 - .4 | 6.1 + .4 | 1.37 |
| E | 85.2 | 24 | 4.4 + .1 | 5.7 0 | .81 |
| AVERAGE | 86.7 | | 4.1 - .2 | 5.5 - .2 | .92 |

| School | Mean I.Q. | N | LANGUAGE G. P. | | Growth Rate Per Year |
|----------------|--------------|----|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Nov. '65 Below Norm | Apr. '67 Below Norm | |
| A | 87.7 | 20 | 4.4 + .1 | 5.4 - .3 | .62 |
| B | 82.0 | 37 | 3.9 - .4 | 4.4 -1.3 | .31 |
| C | 90.9 | 42 | 3.5 - .8 | 4.9 - .8 | .87 |
| D | 90.1 | 71 | 4.0 - .3 | 5.8 + .1 | 1.12 |
| E | 85.2 | 24 | 3.8 - .5 | 5.1 - .6 | .81 |
| AVERAGE | 86.7 | | 3.9 - .4 | 6.1 - .6 | .75 |

SECTION V

CHANGES IN THE ADMINISTRATORS

The basic premise of this investigation was that a major spin-off effect of Title I would be reflected in changes in the administrative operations of participating school districts. The districts in this study were selected for several reasons, the foremost of which was that the investigators had certain pre-Title I objective and observational data from an earlier study which could be used as a basis for determining changes in both administrative operations and the administrators which occurred during the period covered by the study.

The same questionnaires, standardized tests, and Q sort employed in the earlier study were administered in August, 1966, to secure comparable data for the determination of changes in administrators' perceptions of their: (1) Job Description (tasks), (2) Administrative Problems, (3) Purposes of Education and (4) Leadership Opinion on Structure and Consideration. These data were treated statistically and are here reported in tabular form even though the instruments were not administered a second time as planned. Additional data from the investigators' observer-participant records are also referred to throughout this section.

The Job Description Form

To respond to the question, "What changes have occurred in the administrators' perceptions of their jobs?" the Job Description Form (JDF) was used. This open-ended questionnaire requested that each administrator respond to a series of introductory phrases designed to

elicit descriptions of the way he discharged his responsibilities in the categories of: (1) Instruction, (2) School Organization, (3) Personnel, (4) Community Relations and (5) Management. Each discrete response was transposed onto cards and given to four persons (raters) familiar with the rationale underlying the above cited categories. Each rater assigned each card to one of the categories. A chi square test was computed to determine whether or not the card placements were significantly different. The mean number of cards assigned each category was then computed and used in the statistical analysis. Responses from the winter of 1965 (Post 1) were compared with the summer of 1966 (Post 2) responses and chi square was used to determine if there were differences in responses in these two sets of data. The significance of the difference in proportions was also computed between each individual category for each district's participants.

The responses made by the administrators in each district appear in the following tables. Those for all administrators appear in Table XXII.

TABLE XVIII

JOB TASKS AS DERIVED FROM THE JOB DESCRIPTION
FORM FOR ADMINISTRATORS IN DISTRICT I

| Category | 16 Administrators Post 1 (1965) | | 20 Administrators Post 2 (1966) | | Significance of Difference in Proportion |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | Number of Tasks | Per cent of Total | Number of Tasks | Per cent of Total | |
| Instructional Program | 12 | 9 | 40 | 17 | * |
| School Organization | 14 | 11 | 52 | 22 | * |
| Personnel | 15 | 12 | 17 | 07 | NS |
| Community Relations | 3 | 2 | 15 | 06 | NS |
| Management | 83 | 65 | 115 | 48 | * |
| TOTALS | 127 | | 239 | | |
| | | $x^2 = 17.64$ | | .05 with 4 df's | *Significant at .05 level |

The overall number of job tasks reported by the administrators of District I increased from the 1965 group to those responding in 1966. The latter group reported a total of 239 tasks as compared to only 127 for this district's administrators in 1965. The chi square for these data is significant at the .05 level which indicates that changes took place within the categories. Results reported in Table XVIII were supported by the investigator's observation in that significant change seemed to occur in this administrative staff's perceptions of their responsibilities in both the Instructional Program and School Organization categories. Observations also supported the reported decrease in the administrators' involvement in Management.

These data also indicate that District I's administrative staff reported an increase in the number of tasks associated with their jobs-- an average increase of from eight to twelve for each person.

The observer-participant data support the inference that these differences are in part attributable to Title I because it required the administrators to focus more of their attention on the instructional program. The introduction of Title I projects and the office of the Title I director in each district upset the existing structure and required some realignment in school organization. Sensitivity to community reaction possibly resulted in an initial increase in activities related to community relations while the employment of clerks, aides and secretaries somewhat reduced the administrators' involvement in management matters. The addition of instructional personnel caused him to spend more time in supervising their work.

TABLE XIX
 JOB TASKS AS DERIVED FROM THE JOB DESCRIPTION
 FORM FOR ADMINISTRATORS IN DISTRICT II

| Category | 21 Administrators Post 1 (1965) | | 23 Administrators Post 2 (1966) | | Significance of Difference in Proportion |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | Number of Tasks | Per cent of Total | Number of Tasks | Per cent of Total | |
| Instructional Program | 31 | 16 | 57 | 20 | NS |
| School Organization | 27 | 14 | 61 | 21 | NS |
| Personnel | 19 | 9 | 40 | 14 | NS |
| Community Relations | 16 | 8 | 17 | 06 | NS |
| Management | 105 | 53 | 109 | 38 | * |
| TOTALS | 198 | | 284 | | *Significant at .05 level |
| | | $x^2 = 13.01$ | | .05 with 4 df's | |

District II's administrative staff increased from twenty-one to twenty-three between 1965 and 1966. The number of job tasks reported, however, increased from 198 to 284. The average administrator reported an increase of from 9.2 tasks to 12.3. The chi square for these data is significant at the .05 level indicating changes within the categories.

The per cent of tasks increased in only three categories (Instructional Programs, School Organization and Personnel) while decreasing in both Community Relations and Management. Examined individually, the only category evidencing significant change was the decrease in the number of tasks reported under Management.

Observer-participant data indicated that the employment of clerks, aides, secretaries and lunchroom personnel reduced these administrators' involvement in Management activities, also the availability of funds to provide free lunches and instructional materials relieved these administrators

from having to raise such funds from within their own schools. Equally, the introduction of new materials, new programs and additional personnel under Title I explained in part the increase in the number of tasks associated with Instruction, Organization and Personnel.

TABLE XX

JOB TASKS AS DERIVED FROM THE JOB DESCRIPTION
FORM FOR ADMINISTRATORS FOR DISTRICT III

| Category | 19 Administrators Post 1 (1965) | | 26 Administrators Post 2 (1966) | | Significance of Difference in Proportion |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | Number of Tasks | Per cent of Total | Number of Tasks | Per cent of Total | |
| Instructional Program | 48 | 17 | 81 | 21 | NS |
| School Organization | 39 | 14 | 77 | 20 | * |
| Personnel | 71 | 25 | 46 | 12 | * |
| Community Relations | 18 | 6 | 41 | 10 | NS |
| Management | 108 | 38 | 147 | 37 | NS |
| TOTALS | 284 | | 392 | | *Significant at .05 level |
| | | $\chi^2 = 24.34$ | | .05 with 4 df's | |

Table XX indicates that overall the job tasks reported by the administrators in District III increased from 284 in 1965 to 392 in 1966--an increase of 108. While the total number of administrators increased from nineteen to twenty-three, the average job tasks reported per administrator increased from 14.8 to 15.1. The chi square computed from these data is significant at the .05 level indicating that changes occurred within the categories.

While increases were reported in three of the categories, only that in School Organization was significant. A significant decrease, however, occurred in the tasks reported under Personnel while those in Management remained practically static.

Again, the changes might be explained in relation to Table XVIII. The work to assess program needs and the programs planned to reduce these focused attention on Instruction. New programs and personnel generated organizational problems. Changes in the schools' activities required increased activity in public relations. Increase in personnel, a larger division of labor via the use of teacher aides, appeared to be associated with the decrease in the number of tasks reported in Personnel

TABLE XXI

JOB TASKS AS DERIVED FROM THE JOB DESCRIPTION
FORM FOR ADMINISTRATORS IN DISTRICT IV

| Category | 8 Administrators Post 1 (1965) | | 9 Administrators Post 2 (1966) | | Significance of Difference in Proportion |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | Number of Tasks | Per cent of Total | Number of Tasks | Per cent of Total | |
| Instructional Program | 13 | 16 | 17 | 23 | NS |
| School Organization | 15 | 18 | 12 | 16 | NS |
| Personnel | 16 | 19 | 4 | 05 | * |
| Community Relations | 9 | 11 | 9 | 12 | NS |
| Management | 30 | 36 | 33 | 44 | NS |
| TOTALS | 83 | | 75 | | *Significant at .05 level |
| | | $\chi^2 = 7.58$ | NS | | |

Overall, the job tasks as described by the administrators in District IV in 1966 were not significantly different from those in 1965. In 1966, the administrators identified 75 job tasks as compared to 83 by the 1965 group. This means that an average of 8.3 job tasks were described by each administrator in 1966 while 10.4 tasks had been described by each in 1965. Chi square for this data indicates that no significant changes occurred within the categories.

No category showed a significant increase, and only Instructional Program, Community Relations, and Management categories showed slight increases. However, one category, Personnel, showed a significant decrease in the job tasks reported. School organization also decreased, but only slightly.

The relatively slight change that occurred in District IV might have been related to a myriad of factors among which was the fact that the Title I programs in this district were directed toward more impersonal activities - library services, health, physical education and recreation and in-service education. Few of these administrators were required to modify their operations to accommodate such additions.

TABLE XXII

JOB TASKS AS DERIVED FROM THE JOB DESCRIPTION FORM
FOR ADMINISTRATORS IN ALL DISTRICTS

| Category | 64 Administrators Post 1 (1965) | | 78 Administrators Post 2 (1966) | | Significance of Difference in Proportion |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | Number of Tasks | Per cent of Total | Number of Tasks | Per cent of Total | |
| Instructional Program | 104 | 15 | 195 | 20 | * |
| School Organization | 95 | 14 | 202 | 20 | * |
| Personnel | 121 | 17 | 107 | 11 | * |
| Community Relations | 46 | 07 | 82 | 08 | NS |
| Management | 326 | 47 | 404 | 41 | * |
| TOTALS | 692 | | 990 | | *Significant at .05 level |
| | | $x^2 = 33.82$ | | .05 with 4 df's | |

Table XXII indicates that when district limitations are ignored and all administrators considered as a group, the total reported job tasks increased significantly. In 1966, seventy-eight administrators identified

a total of 990 job tasks as compared to only 692 by the sixty-four persons in the 1965 group. This means an average of 10.3 tasks were described by each administrator in 1965 while 12.7 tasks were identified by each in 1966.

Significant increases in proportional differences were reported in two categories - Instructional Programs and School Organization. Significant decreases occurred in the Personnel and Management categories.

Three of the categories showed consistent changes in three of the four districts. Tasks associated with Instruction and Organization consistently increased while those reported under Management decreased. No consistent changes are discernible in the other categories.

TABLE XXIII

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN JOB TASKS BY DISTRICT

| District | Instructional Program | School Organization | Personnel | Community Relations | Management | |
|----------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|---------------------|------------|----|
| One | ++ | ++ | -- | +-- | --* | ** |
| Two | + | + | + | - | --* | ** |
| Three | + | + | --* | + | -- | ** |
| Four | -- | + | + | + | -- | |
| Total | ++ | ++ | --* | + | --* | ** |

* Proportion Significant at .05

** χ^2 Significant at .05 level

Table XXIII indicates that total changes in the number of job tasks identified in each district were significant in Districts I, II and III. They were not significant in District IV, but the district's data were included in the table to show their effect on the column totals and to give an indication of the direction of changes which did occur.

Overall changes seem to indicate that administrators in all four districts became more cognizant of job tasks in the categories of Instruction and School Organization. This is shown by the increased number of tasks identified in these two areas in three of the districts. Only in District I were the increased proportions statistically significant. However, when taken as a totality, the combined effect of the increase in numbers of tasks is significant in both Instruction and School Organization.

These administrators' perceptions of job tasks decreased in both the Personnel and Management categories significantly as a totality.

There was a small, but not significant, increase in the Community Relations category. None of the individual districts' proportions in this area was significant thus indicating some but little change in this area.

The combined totals, thus, indicate that the administrators, as a whole, increased their perceptions of job tasks in the areas of Instructional Programs and School Organization, decreased in Personnel and Management and remained unchanged in Community Relations.

The investigators' observer-participant data tend to verify the data in Table XXIII. The administrators, in general, appeared caught up in a series of tasks directed primarily at the improvement of educational opportunities for deprived children. The districts' programs under Title I directly and indirectly focused attention upon instructional improvement. The administrators appeared more active in the Instructional aspect than previously. Of necessity they were also more deeply involved in organizational matters such as the grouping of children, scheduling of children, teachers and facilities and supervising the programs. Since deviations from established

practices were likely to result in adverse public reaction, the administrators tended to strengthen their relations with various segments of the public.

The investigators' observations indicated that such Management activities as operating a school store was increasingly assigned to secretaries or clerks thus decreasing the time and attention formerly demanded of the administrator. The decrease in tasks associated with Personnel was observed to be related to both the increase in the size of staffs and to staffs' satisfaction stemming from the acquisition of instructional materials, equipment and aides. Thus it could be that added personnel and materials contributed to the decrease in administrative tasks associated with both Management and Personnel.

Therefore, these data seem to indicate that the administrators somewhat changed their perceptions of the tasks associated with their job during the brief time Title I programs have been operative.

The Problems Identification Instrument

It was assumed that the problems administrators perceived to be related to their jobs would undergo a change due, in part, to the introduction of Title I. It was also assumed that such changes would be discernible to the observer-participants and reportable by the administrators. Therefore, all administrators responded to a problems identification instrument constructed to elicit self-identified, job-related problems associated with their responsibilities.

An initial analysis of these data revealed no significant changes in the number of problems reported per administrator. The change was from an average of 12.9 problems per administrator in 1965 to 13.1 in

1966. It was anticipated that reapplication of this instrument in the Spring of 1967 would yield data which would show significant changes in these administrators' job-related problems.

The observer-participant data indicated that these administrators now perceive their problems differently than in 1965. Therefore, it is the investigators' impression that while the number of problems changed but little, their nature changed considerably more.

Leadership Opinion Questionnaire

It was assumed that Title I's impact on administrators might be reflected in their attitudes toward organizational structure and consideration of people. Earlier work by Andrew Halpin indicated a relationship between these two administrative characteristics and effectiveness in administration. Science Research Associates developed from Halpin's work an instrument designed to measure an individual's tendencies in these two categories and published it as the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. This instrument (LOQ) treats these characteristics independently so that a person can score high on both, low on both or high on one and low on the other.

Participants' responses to the LOQ were treated so that means, standard deviations, significance of mean differences (t-tests) and correlations were computed for the 1965 group (Post 1) and the administrators participating in 1966 (Post 2). The significance of mean differences (t-tests) indicated the amount of change occurring between the 1965 and the 1966 administration of the instrument. Computations were made for administrators in each district and for the total group on both factors, structure and consideration.

To determine whether or not the administrators who responded to the LOQ in 1965 had changed in regard to the Structure characteristics, a comparison was made of the 1965 (Post 1) and the 1966 (Post 2) scores for those who responded in each instance. These comparisons (by district and by total group) appear in Table XXIV below.

TABLE XXIV

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS, SIGNIFICANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND CORRELATIONS FOR STRUCTURE SCORE OF THE LEADERSHIP OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADMINISTRATORS IN 1965 WHO REMAINED IN 1966

| District | N | Test Time | Mean | Standard Deviation | T-Test | Correlation |
|----------|----|-----------|------|--------------------|--------|-------------|
| One | 16 | Post 1 | 50.3 | 5.78 | | |
| | 16 | Post 2 | 48.1 | 5.31 | 1.12 | .39 |
| Two | 20 | Post 1 | 47.8 | 7.14 | | |
| | 20 | Post 2 | 48.8 | 9.56 | .37 | .66* |
| Three | 18 | Post 1 | 49.6 | 5.47 | | |
| | 18 | Post 2 | 51.1 | 6.70 | .74 | .42 |
| Four | 7 | Post 1 | 45.3 | 7.23 | | |
| | 7 | Post 2 | 45.6 | 4.36 | .09 | .66 |
| Total | 61 | Post 1 | 48.6 | 6.13 | | |
| | 61 | Post 2 | 48.9 | 7.05 | .21 | |

*Significant .05

The data in Table XXIV indicate that whether computed by district or by total group, there was no significant difference in the LOQ scores on Structure for those administrators who responded in both 1965 and 1966. Therefore, these administrators apparently had not changed significantly in regard to the Structure factors since the advent of Title I.

To determine whether or not the inclusion of the new administrators (including Title I personnel) would affect the administrators' LOQ scores on Structure a comparison was made between the 1965 (Post 1) respondents and the total administrative staff in 1966 (Post 2). This comparison appears in the following table.

TABLE XXV

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS, SIGNIFICANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES FOR STRUCTURE SCORES OF THE LEADERSHIP OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADMINISTRATORS IN 1965 WHO REMAINED IN 1966 AGAINST THE TOTAL STAFF IN 1966

| District | N | Test Time | Mean | Standard Deviation | T-Test |
|----------|----|-----------|------|--------------------|--------|
| One | 16 | Post 1 | 45.8 | 6.47 | |
| | 20 | Post 2 | 48.1 | 5.17 | -1.17 |
| Two | 20 | Post 1 | 48.8 | 10.37 | |
| | 23 | Post 2 | 48.1 | 9.69 | .22 |
| Three | 18 | Post 1 | 48.4 | 7.85 | |
| | 26 | Post 2 | 49.4 | 7.35 | -.43 |
| Four | 7 | Post 1 | 46.6 | 8.18 | |
| | 9 | Post 2 | 48.0 | 6.64 | -.39 |
| Total | 61 | Post 1 | 47.6 | 8.28 | |
| | 78 | Post 2 | 48.0 | 7.29 | -.60 |

These data indicate that the inclusion of new administrative personnel resulted in no significant changes in these administrators' scores on Structure whether computed as districts or as a total group. It is then inferred that the newly appointed members of the administrative staff in each district had a regard for Structure similar to that shared by the experienced administrators. Their addition resulted in no significant change in any district's administrative staff's propensity for Structure.

The administrators' scores on the Consideration factor of the LOQ was also computed to determine whether or not the 1965 (Post 1) group which continued in each district had changed in their inclination for Consideration by 1966 (Post 2). These comparisons appear below.

TABLE XXVI

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS, SIGNIFICANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND CORRELATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION SCORE OF THE LEADERSHIP OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADMINISTRATORS IN 1965 WHO REMAINED IN 1966

| District | N | Test Time | Mean | Standard Deviation | T-Test | Correlation |
|----------|----|-----------|------|--------------------|--------|-------------|
| One | 16 | Post 1 | 53.1 | 9.17 | | |
| | 16 | Post 2 | 55.3 | 7.29 | .75 | .60* |
| Two | 20 | Post 1 | 58.4 | 5.48 | | |
| | 20 | Post 2 | 56.9 | 5.84 | .67 | .57* |
| Three | 18 | Post 1 | 58.0 | 6.03 | | |
| | 18 | Post 2 | 57.3 | 5.34 | .38 | .40 |
| Four | 7 | Post 1 | 63.0 | 5.54 | | |
| | 7 | Post 2 | 57.7 | 6.45 | 1.66 | .92* |
| Total | 61 | Post 1 | 57.3 | 6.58 | | |
| | 61 | Post 2 | 56.7 | 5.98 | .55 | |

*Significant at .05 level

The above data show no significant differences in the scores of the 1965 (Post 1) administrators as compared to scores for the same group in 1966 (Post 2) when computed by districts or by totals for all districts. Thus these administrators' feelings for Consideration did not change significantly between the test and re-test use of the LOQ.

Computations were also made to determine whether a district's and/or the total group of administrators' scores on Consideration would be significantly affected by the induction of new personnel. Table XXVII displays the results.

TABLE XXVII

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS, SIGNIFICANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND CORRELATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION SCORE OF THE LEADERSHIP OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADMINISTRATORS IN 1965 WHO REMAINED IN 1966 AGAINST THE TOTAL STAFF IN 1966

| District | N | Test Time | Mean | Standard Deviation | T-Test |
|----------|----|-----------|------|--------------------|--------|
| One | 16 | Post 1 | 54.4 | 7.75 | |
| | 20 | Post 2 | 55.8 | 5.88 | -.60 |
| Two | 20 | Post 1 | 58.0 | 5.29 | |
| | 23 | Post 2 | 56.5 | 6.02 | .90 |
| Three | 18 | Post 1 | 57.4 | 5.57 | |
| | 26 | Post 2 | 57.1 | 7.80 | .17 |
| Four | 7 | Post 1 | 62.4 | 5.06 | |
| | 9 | Post 2 | 57.0 | 6.24 | 2.05 |
| Total | 61 | Post 1 | 57.5 | 6.64 | |
| | 78 | Post 2 | 56.6 | 6.87 | .79 |

*Significant at .05 level

The above data indicate that additions to administrative staffs felt much like the other administrators, for their inclusion resulted in no significant difference when all districts were treated as an entity.

In brief, administrators who responded to the LOQ in 1965 and again in 1966 did not change their responses enough for there to be a significant difference in their scores on either the Consideration or the Structure factor. Administrators added after the 1965 administration of the instrument were enough like the other administrators so that their scores were not significantly different except in District IV where two new persons caused a significant decrease in the district's scores on Consideration. Hence, in response to the question, "Did the administrators change in their attitude about Structure and Consideration?" the response would be "no" with the exception of District IV.

The observer-participant data in general support the above. However, the investigators have the general impression that these phenomena are changing. For example, in all but District IV, a more formal set of procedures have been followed in staff meetings and in establishing operational practices. The administrators seem to be becoming more conscious of the need for organizational structure, but their past experiences limit the rapidity with which they can alter these established patterns. Consideration for people does, in some districts, seem to be altering in the direction toward an increased respect for their abilities in determining and executing operational plans and an increase in expectations for the positions they fill.

The Purposes of Education Q-Sort

The Purposes of Education Q-Sort (PQS) was developed by Russell Renz to obtain a profile of a respondent's perceptions of 100 frequently enunciated purposes of education. It has been used to determine whether or not the administrative staffs changed in their perceptions of purposes of education between 1965 and 1966.

The PQS consists of 100 cards each containing a philosophical statement of educational purpose. The respondent sorts these cards into nine piles with each pile containing a designated number of cards so that the final distribution forms a normal probability curve along a continuum of "Least Like Me to Most Like Me." The N for each distribution remains constant at 100.

The PQS was first analyzed in this study to determine whether the deletions and additions in administrative staffs between 1965 (Post 1) and 1966 (Post 2) resulted in differences in perceptions of the purposes of education. These data appear in the following table.

TABLE XXVIII

CHANGES IN PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATION PURPOSES, BY DISTRICT COMPOSITES, AS DERIVED FROM THE PURPOSES OF EDUCATION Q-SORT: TOTAL STAFF IN 1965 AGAINST TCTAL STAFF IN 1966

| District | N Post 1 1965 | N Post 2 1966 | Correlation | Significance of Correlation |
|----------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| One | 17 | 20 | .82 | * |
| Two | 20 | 23 | .83 | * |
| Three | 20 | 26 | .88 | * |
| Four | 9 | 9 | .73 | * |
| Total | 66 | 78 | | *Significant at .05 |

The above table indicates that even though changes occurred in the composition of the administrative staff in each district, correlations were of such size to warrant the inference that there was little difference between the two group's perceptions of the purposes of education. Thus, it seems that in each district new personnel held purposes quite similar to the group of administrators which they joined.

The data were next analyzed to determine whether there was a difference between the administrators who remained in each district in 1966 (Post 2) and the total administrative staff in 1965 (Post 1). Table XXIX displays the results of this computation.

TABLE XXIX

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATION PURPOSES, BY DISTRICT COMPOSITES, AS DERIVED FROM THE PURPOSES OF EDUCATION Q-SORT: TOTAL STAFF IN 1965 AGAINST THOSE WHO REMAINED IN 1966 (EXCEPT TITLE I)

| District | N Post 1 1965 | N Post 2 1966 | Correlation | Significance of Correlation |
|----------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| One | 17 | 15 | .80 | * |
| Two | 20 | 21 | .79 | * |
| Three | 20 | 17 | .86 | * |
| Four | 9 | 7 | .66 | * |
| Total | 66 | 60 | | *Significant at .05 |

As evident, the administrators who remained in the districts continued to report perceptions of purposes much like the entire group had in 1965. As a group, then, these administrators seem to have changed but little. This might be explained by the brevity of time between the two administrations.

Next, the Q sort data were analyzed to determine the extent to which persons employed under Title I saw educational purposes like the 1965 administrative staffs who continued into 1966. These data appear in Table XXX, on the following page.

TABLE XXX

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATION PURPOSES, BY DISTRICT COMPOSITES, AS DERIVED FROM THE PURPOSES OF EDUCATION Q-SORT: STAFF MEMBERS IN 1965 WHO REMAINED IN 1966 AGAINST TITLE I STAFF

| District | N Post 1 1965 | N Post 2 1966 | Correlations | Significance of Correlation |
|----------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| One | 15 | 2 | .57 | * |
| Two | 21 | 2 | .58 | * |
| Three | 17 | 5 | .68 | * |
| Four | 7 | 0 ¹ | | * |
| Total | 60 | 9 | | *Significant at .05 |

¹The Title I Staff Member Did Not Respond

The above table shows that Title I administrative personnel differed somewhat from those regular administrators who continued in 1966. Since the correlations in the three districts in which Title I persons responded to the sort were all significant and unlikely to have occurred by chance, there appears to be a difference between the Title I and other administrators.

The Q-Sort data were further analyzed to determine whether or not new administrators appointed to non-Title I positions in each district differed from those administrators who had continued from the 1965 staffs. Table XXXI, on the following page, displays the results of this analysis. The data indicate that in those three districts employing new, non-Title I, administrators there was a difference in their perceptions of the purposes of education and those perceptions held by the group that continued from 1965. Both the size and significance of the correlations except in District III, show that the new administrators believed quite differently about the purposes of education.

TABLE XXXI

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATION PURPOSES, BY DISTRICT
COMPOSITES, AS DERIVED FROM THE PURPOSES OF EDUCATION Q-SORT:
STAFF FROM 1965 WHO REMAINED IN 1966 AGAINST NEW STAFF
MEMBERS IN 1966 (EXCEPT TITLE I)

| District | N Post 1 1965 | N Post 2 1966 | Correlation | Significance of Correlation |
|----------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| One | 15 | 3 | .48 | * |
| Two | 21 | 0 | | |
| Three | 17 | 4 | .74 | * |
| Four | 7 | 2 | .43 | * |
| Total | 60 | 9 | | *Significant at .05 |

A final examination of the Q sort data was made to determine whether the new administrators differed from the Title I administrative staffs. The results appear in Table XXXII.

TABLE XXXII

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATION PURPOSES, BY DISTRICT
COMPOSITES, AS DERIVED FROM THE PURPOSES OF EDUCATION Q-SORT:
NEW ADMINISTRATORS AGAINST TITLE I STAFF

| District | N Post 1 1965 | N Post 2 1966 | Correlation | Significance of Correlation |
|----------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| One | 3 | 2 | .45 | * |
| Two | 0 | 2 | | |
| Three | 4 | 5 | .65 | |
| Four | 2 | 0 | | * |
| Total | 9 | 9 | | *Significant at .05 |

Only two districts, I and III, had added both new and Title I administrators. The low correlations for these districts indicate that the two groups differed somewhat in their perceptions of the purposes of education. This difference is more pronounced in District I than in District III.

Thus, the data from the Purposes of Education Q-Sort seem to indicate:

1. Little change in the purposes held by those administrators who responded in both 1965 and 1966.
2. New persons, both Title I and other administrators, seem to differ somewhat in their perceptions of purposes of education from the group which had continued from 1965.
3. New administrators and Title I administrators seemed to hold somewhat different perceptions of the purposes of education.
4. When the Title I and other new administrators are combined with the administrative staffs which continued from 1965 there appears to be little difference between this group and total administrative staff of 1965.

Observer-participant data supported the above. Little change has occurred. It is evident, however, that in certain cases the new and Title I administrators are different from the larger group.

In response to a query relative to changes in the administrative staffs' perceptions of purposes of education, the response is negative. There were no significant changes; however, the differences within each staff appear to be greater now than in 1965 because of the additions to these staffs.

SUMMARY

In general terms, the limited data in this section seem to indicate that:

1. There were changes in the administrative staffs' perceptions of their jobs particularly in an increased involvement in Instructional Programs, School Organization and Community Relations. There was a decrease in the administrators' tasks associated with Personnel and Management.
2. There was an increase in the gross number of problems reported by the administrative staffs. However, there were also increases in the number of administrators so that the ratio of problems per administrator was approximately the same. The observer-participant data indicate a slight change in the nature of the problems of concern to the participants.
3. No significant changes occurred in the administrators' propensities for Structure or Consideration as measured by the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire.
4. The administrative staffs of 1965 changed their perceptions of the purposes of education very little by 1966. While differing from each other, both the new administrators and Title I administrators differed from the continuing group so that each district's total administrative staff seems to be changing in their perceptions of educational goals. The significance of the data is destroyed by the fact that no post data was secured. Therefore, the changes identified above are only those which occurred between the winter of 1965 and summer of 1966. What changes have occurred during the first full year of Title I becomes only a question of speculation.

As is evident, only in School D were children making normal or above normal progress. Therefore, these data would not indicate marked student progress as a result of Title I. However, this District's first Title I grant was used for programs other than direct remedial services to children. The school year 1966-67 found remedial reading and operative library programs initiated and implemented. Thus data from the next year would be a more adequate base from which to draw inferences.

SECTION VI

OBSERVATIONS ON CHANGES

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (PL 89-10) unquestionably has had more potential for producing rapid change in the school districts of this study than any event in their history. Financial budgets were increased dramatically overnight, many new personnel were employed and the development of new instructional programs was necessitated. Additionally, Title I forced these districts to attempt, regardless of the quality of the effort, to assess needs and to develop some system of evaluating what had been done.

The determination of such changes as a result of Title I presents many problems, for other forces affecting change were present in these school districts. Other Titles of ESEA had some impact as did the Office of Economic Opportunity's activities during the period. Another uncontrolled variable is illustrated by the fact that one district changed its superintendent. There were also shifts in administrative personnel in all of the districts. The presence of the investigators and assessment consultants undoubtedly had some effect on what was done. Consequently, the changes discussed in this section may have been brought about by different forces but unquestionably the impact of Title I was a major factor.

The administrative behavior of the personnel of these school districts had been previously characterized under six major headings. The same format will be used for discussion here.

These observations are drawn from the data presented in Section IV and from the investigators' observer-participant data. These are reported in gross terms because there were no post objective data to use for validating the observations.

1. Local Orientation. Only minor changes have occurred in this characteristic as these administrators continue to identify themselves with local communities and not with the administration profession. Almost all administrative personnel are natives and outside recruitment efforts have been nil. Outside activities have decreased somewhat due to increased income from summer employment in the school district and to additional stipends for supervising Title I personnel. There appears to be some increase in the amount of reading of professional materials and an increasing interest in and questioning about activities in education outside their districts.

2. Non-formal Organization. More change is evident, perhaps, in this characteristic than in any other. In districts I and III substantial change has appeared. There has been a conscious effort to define responsibilities with job descriptions. Competence in personnel has been sought by development of requirements of employment in certain new positions. Definite procedural routines have been established in several areas. In these two districts (I and III) communication has been improved with regular administrative staff meetings. Agenda are pre-planned and minutes of each meeting are written and distributed. In both districts, a series of meetings with teachers were held to solicit their suggestions on Title I programs. In District III particularly, efforts have been made to improve record keeping and develop systematic routines. Both districts are attempting to develop testing programs to make available reliable data for evaluation purposes. Both, however, have much to do in this area to develop uniform procedures.

In Districts II and IV considerably less has been done. In District II, the superintendent has expressed dissatisfaction with the present organization but has made no movement toward changing it. In District IV there has been no system-wide effort, but some individual principals have moved within their schools, to develop policies and routine procedures. There is no evidence that the superintendent has given any overt support to these efforts.

3. Emphasis Upon Maintenance. Very little change is evident in this characteristic. A primary objective is to have a smooth operation and to avoid controversy. However, in all of the districts, but particularly in I and III, there is evidence of growing awareness of the importance of the development of school programs of quality. Perhaps out of this awareness will come in the future the courage to take those actions necessary without regard for the possibility of controversy.

4. Emphasis Upon Management. There is evident some decrease in this emphasis in all of the districts - particularly among principals. The addition of clerical and secretarial help, made possible by Title I funds has enabled the administrators to spend less time upon management activities. The lack of clarity of assignment of additional personnel in districts II and IV, however, has necessitated that principals exercise close supervision, thus substituting one kind of management activity for another.

Title I funds have been used to supply free lunches for many indigent children in all of the districts, and as a result, the financial pressure on the lunchroom operation has lessened. This has freed principals to some extent of a pressure which caused them to spend inordinate amounts of time supervising the lunchrooms to assure that the lunchroom did not lose money.

5. Little Administrative Attention to Curriculum. The initiation and implementation of Title I programs has necessitated that administrators give more attention to curriculum matters. In all four districts, the administrators have been forced to make decisions regarding programs and to get into classrooms for discussions with teachers on these decisions. Frequently, the discussions have been only on the level of scheduling and general routine. However, there have been some more fundamental considerations, by some administrators, of objectives and relationships among various elements of the instructional program.

In districts I and III district-wide attention is being given to the development of curriculum materials. Although these efforts are still in the early stages and lack comprehensiveness and consistency, the movement is encouraging. In District IV, individual principals are making some efforts in this direction, but there is no evidence of a district-wide movement.

While Title I programs have forced the administrators to give more attention to curriculum problems, the real test will come when these new programs have become integral parts of the districts' continuing program. It is possible that when this condition occurs, the administrators will revert to giving curriculum little attention. Only in districts I and III is there much evidence that any effort will be made to prevent this reversion.

6. Supporting Personnel Practices. Local residents still have priority in employment practices in all districts. No district has developed a systematic recruitment program. The prevailing practice is still to hire whoever applies as long as they are perceived as persons who will support the characteristic operation of the districts.

However, in districts I and III there is evidence of a developing awareness of the need for competency on the part of personnel and some selectiveness based on judgment of competency, is being exercised, at least verbally. These two superintendents indicate that they would hire outsiders in order to acquire personnel with specific abilities.

It is evident in the foregoing discussion that two districts, I and III have made greater changes than districts II and IV. Districts I and III were judged initially by the investigators to have more competent personnel, particularly the superintendents, and to be somewhat more efficient and effective school systems. During the period of this study, the gap between districts I and III and districts II and IV has widened. Before Title I money became available, all of these school districts were so limited financially that little opportunity existed for the development of noticeable differences. The availability of Title I funds has enabled these two districts to make some movement toward more effective school operation. Change in the two other districts has been minimal. The answer to the question of the differences made by Title I programs on administrative operations is a qualified one. The programs have made a difference, but the amount of the difference is dependent upon district variables. The conclusion is that the quality of the personnel, particularly the superintendent, is a crucial variable in determining the quantity and quality of educational change resulting from such externally induced stimuli as Title I.

APPENDIX A

Items Comprising The Problems Identification Instrument

| Name | Position | School District | Date |
|---|----------|-----------------|------|
| I. <u>Instructional Program</u> | | | |
| List the problems y u have in developing and implementing the instructional program in your school (s). BE AS SPECIFIC AS YOU CAN AND ARRANGE THESE PROBLEMS IN ORDER OF DIFFICULTY. | | | |
| II. <u>School Organization</u> | | | |
| List the problems you have in the organization of your school or in the organization of your school district. Include those problems associated with the school structure, the assignment of responsibilities and authority. BE SPECIFIC AND ARRANGE THESE PROBLEMS IN ORDER OF DIFFICULTY. | | | |
| III. <u>Personnel</u> | | | |
| List the problems you have in relationship to the personnel with whom you work. Include those problems associated with selection, performance and inservice education. BE SPECIFIC AND ARRANGE THESE PROBLEMS IN ORDER OF DIFFICULTY. | | | |
| IV. <u>Community Relations</u> | | | |
| List the problem ^e you have in relationship to your community. Include those problems associated with obtaining community support and in informing the community about the school. BE SPECIFIC AND ARRANGE THESE PROBLEMS IN ORDER OF DIFFICULTY. | | | |
| V. <u>School Management</u> | | | |
| List the problems you have in managing your school (s). Include those problems associated with buildings and facilities, school finance, and handling the "details" of everyday school management. BE SPECIFIC AND ARRANGE THESE PROBLEMS IN ORDER OF DIFFICULTY. | | | |

APPENDIX B

Items Comprising The Job Description Form

Name _____ Exact Title Of Position: _____

Responsible To: _____

I. Areas of school operation in which you have responsibilities:

II. Specific nature of responsibility in each area:

APPENDIX C

Items Comprising The Leadership Q-Sort¹

1. Does not always feel responsible for answering questions directed at him.
2. Tries to restrict highly verbal members who "drown out" less vociferous members.
3. Does not feel uncomfortable when group wanders from agenda.
4. Keeps a certain amount of distance between himself and group members in order to be most effective as a leader.
5. Lets group members encroach upon his functions.
6. Skillfully draws out non-participants by asking them questions.
7. Often lets an inaccurate statement go by unchallenged.
8. Raises questions when discussion lags.
9. Brings his feelings out in front of the group when he is irritated or angry.
10. Adjusts pace of learning to the readiness of its members.
11. Helps group to relate comments of group members to the central stream of thought of the group.
12. Diagnoses group's needs as a guide for his action.
13. Helps group understand what a particular person is saying.
14. Takes responsibility to inform group when it strays from the topic or goes off on tangents.
15. Participates in defining tasks, and goals.
16. May on occasion use his prestige to get the group to accept what is right.
17. Does not make any effort to keep strong feelings out of an intellectual discussion.
18. Is sensitive in recognizing irrelevant contributions of members.
19. Does not follow a consistent procedural pattern of group operation (e.g., parliamentary procedure.)
20. Tactfully discourages the "blocker."
21. Feels need to respond to almost every contribution, even those that are not particularly helpful.
22. Tries to state his opinions so that group will feel he is neutral.
23. Does not take responsibility for restricting participation of members who monopolize discussions.
24. Makes certain that discussion will occur by asking individuals beforehand to raise questions.
25. Rarely conveys his diagnoses of the group.
26. Clarifies member's statements but doesn't add ideas of his own to the discussion.
27. Withholds his evaluations from the group while he has leadership status.

¹Applying the Q-Technique as devised by William Stephenson and reported in, The Study of Behavior: Q-Technique and Its Methodology (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), Thomas Gordon reports this Leadership Q-Sort in Group Centered Leadership (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1955).

APPENDIX C (continued)

28. Successfully prevents feelings of rivalry, hostility, resentment and the like from being expressed in the group.
29. Speaks clearly and convincingly.
30. Believes people can become more self-responsible.
31. Acts on behalf of the group.
32. Feels he must set a high moral example.
33. Helps group evaluate its progress.
34. Feels that everyone ought to talk in a meeting.
35. Defends position vigorously on occasion.
36. Feels superior to group members because of superior training and experience.
37. Is sensitive to the desires of the group.
38. Feels he can learn things from the group.
39. Knows what roles the group needs for effective operation.
40. Believes that productivity depends upon each man's own decisive activity.
41. Is concerned to make every member feel "at home" and belong to the group.
42. Feels the most effective learning is through participation.
43. Is very much aware of the members of a group who have power and those who don't.
44. Feels more responsibility than most group members.
45. Gives considerable attention to development of all group members into some form of participation.
46. Believes he must be a symbol for the group.
47. Lets other members of the group answer group questions.
48. Believes groups are more effective working with some plan.
49. Defends his own position, but does not insist upon the group's following him.
50. Has opinions as to where the group should arrive.
51. Is dynamic and forceful.
52. Has the interest of the group at heart.
53. Knows more than any of the group members about the subject at hand.
54. Feels group members are capable of change.
55. Acts occasionally as an organizing influence and focal point for group activity.
56. Believes he should be an inspiration to other group members.
57. Feels that attacks on his leadership are to be accepted as much as any other feelings.
58. Believes people are generally unmotivated and need inspiration from outside themselves.
59. Believes group will more easily accept or reject his suggestions when he is not seen as "the leader."
60. Believes immature groups need to be first dependent in order to achieve independence.
61. Believes in the inherent goodness of man.
62. Holds to a philosophy which recognizes man's basic anti-social and ego-centered tendencies.

APPENDIX C (continued)

63. Believes to be most effective, a leader must lose his leadership position.
64. Feels he must try to keep the group from taking some kinds of action.
65. Believes "immature" groups need to feel freedom from the influence of authority figures.
66. Believes the leader always should be seen by the group as having more status or ability than the members.
67. Believes the group should be aware of leader's own inadequacies, though it may mean he loses prestige.
68. Feels leader loses prestige when he admits his lack of knowledge.
69. Feels that a decision arrived at by all group members is usually the best decision for the total group.
70. Knows how far he is willing to go along with the group on some things.
71. Hopes group will eventually forget he was "the leader."
72. Feels persons are uncomfortable and ineffective without a leader.
73. Is willing to have the members take over leadership of the group.
74. Feels group often needs leader's influence to bring about the best solution.
75. Is willing to help carry out group decisions which he considers unwise.
76. Feels the group objective takes precedence over the growth and development of the individual group member.
77. Feels his task is to reduce dependency of members upon himself.
78. Believes those less educated and informed often have to be led by those more able to point the way.
79. Feels the leader must become more and more accepted as just another group member.
80. Believes the group can be helped the most if the leader takes initial responsibility for setting goals and content.
81. Feels the group has the capacity to solve its own problems, provided each member feels free to give of himself.
82. Believes individuals are capable of change but often lack insight to change themselves without outside help.
83. Feels leader always ought to trust the potentialities within the group.
84. Feels most groups need the guidance and direction of a skilled leader.

APPENDIX D

Items Comprising The Purposes of Education Q-Sort²

1. Develop capacity to appreciate beauty in literature, art, music, and nature.
2. Develop individual as an asset to the social group.
3. Train for citizenship.
4. Develop abilities.
5. Provide knowledge for intelligent consumership.
6. Cultivate intellectual honesty.
7. Integrate the mind.
8. Stimulate devotion to our way of life.
9. Develop individual for fullest participation in American democracy.
10. Cultivate inquiring mind.
11. Develop understanding of rights and duties of citizenship.
12. Encourage friendships.
13. Draw out the timeless elements of our common human nature.
14. Improve human nature.
15. Enable individual to live a happy life.
16. Provide capacity for further education.
17. Provide growth.
18. Develop understanding of significance of the family.
19. Develop ability to express thoughts clearly.
20. Develop economic competency.
21. Promote law observance.
22. Build civilization.
23. Develop well-adjusted people.
24. Stimulate faith in our form of government.
25. Produce academic literacy.
26. Provide vocational guidance.
27. Train the mind.
28. Learn to apply scientific method to all problems.
29. Foster healthy attitude toward sex relations.
30. Produce a uniform product.
31. Emphasize values.
32. Teach eternal verities, truths, and ideals.
33. Extend our limited vision of truth.
34. Cultivate the love of truth.
35. Produce sound character.
36. Form good moral habits.
37. Connect the present with the past.
38. Promote knowledge of the moral law.
39. Train the sense of duty.
40. Cultivate spiritual competency.

²Russell L. Renz, "Self Directed Learning for Educational Leadership," Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service, Vol. XXXI, No. 1, College of Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, September, 1958.

APPENDIX D (continued)

41. Impel conviction that religion has a place in the life of every individual.
42. Develop ability to think rationally.
43. Develop ability to understand what one reads and hears.
44. Cultivate wisdom.
45. Develop right attitudes.
46. Teach respect for authority.
47. Increase mental power.
48. Provide maximum opportunity for exploration of one's total environment.
49. Discipline the will.
50. Adjust individual to social change.
51. Encourage tolerance.
52. Train the faculties of the mind.
53. Discipline the mind.
54. Develop sense of world citizenship.
55. Encourage critical judgment.
56. Cultivate moral qualities.
57. Optimal physical and mental health.
58. Encourage creativity.
59. Develop native talents.
60. Develop the individual naturally.
61. Achieve internal control in place of external or coercive control.
62. Develop initiative.
63. Develop independent intellectual, esthetic, and practical interests.
64. Enable one to advance socially.
65. Train the moral judgment.
66. Develop individual to his highest capacities.
67. Prepare for the good life.
68. Develop reflective thinking.
69. Mastery of the 3 R's.
70. Reinterpret social ideals and aims.
71. Reconstruct society.
72. Optimal development of human personality.
73. Help individual recognize and understand the operation of natural laws in his environment.
74. Modify ideals, values, and goals of society.
75. Improve social practices.
76. Develop a consistent unified everchanging design for living.
77. Encourage consistency of belief.
78. Enable people to solve problems.
79. Cultivate a common point of view.
80. Improve human personality.
81. Establish appropriate responses by developing neutral bonds between stimuli and responses.
82. Advance good use of leisure time.
83. Provide for unfolding of latent powers toward perfection.
84. Strive for immediate results.
85. Acquire specific habits for future needs.

APPENDIX D (continued)

86. Prepare for adult life.
87. Prepare for daily living.
88. Store the memory with important facts.
89. Learn specific subjects.
90. Increase the sum of knowledge.
91. Acquire knowledge.
92. Provide opportunity to develop leadership.
93. Transmit cultural heritage.
94. Maintain tradition.
95. Provide directed experience in group living.
96. Conserve culture intact.
97. Improvement of the common life.
98. Develop civic competency.
99. Prepare for the common life.
100. Develop respect for humanity.

APPENDIX E

Interview Guide³

The Critical Tasks of School Administration as developed by the Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration was adapted to form an interview guide. Each respondent was asked to describe how the school system was organized and proceeded to achieve each task.

Following is the listing of Critical Tasks:

I. INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

- A. To Provide for the Formulation of Curriculum Objectives.
- B. To Provide for the Determination of Curriculum Content and Organization.
- C. To Relate the Desired Curriculum to Available Time, Physical Facilities, and Personnel.
- D. To Provide Materials, Resources, and Equipment for the Instructional Program.
- E. To Provide for the Supervision of Instruction.
- F. To Provide for In-Service Education of Instructional Personnel.

II. PUPIL PERSONNEL

- A. To Initiate and Maintain a System of Child Accounting and Attendance.
- B. To Institute Measures for the Orientation of Pupils.
- C. To Provide Counseling Services.
- D. To Provide Health Services.
- E. To Provide for Individual Inventory Service.
- F. To Provide Occupational and Educational Information Services.

³Adapted from: Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, Better Teaching in School Administration, 1955, pp. 124-177.

APPENDIX E (continued)

- G. To Provide Placement and Follow-up Services for Pupils.
 - H. To Arrange Systematic Procedures for the Continual Assessment and Interpretation of Pupil Growth (Social Behavior, Academic Progress, Physical and Emotional Development, etc.).
 - I. To Establish Means of Dealing with Pupil Irregularities (Critical Disciplinary Problems, Truancy, etc.).
 - J. To Develop and Coordinate Pupil Activity Programs.
- III. COMMUNITY - SCHOOL LEADERSHIP
- A. To Help Provide an Opportunity for a Community to Recognize its Composition (Formal and Informal Groups, Population Characteristics, Socio-Economic Trends, Economic Base, Power Structure) and Understand its Present Social Policy (Directions, Beliefs, Aims, Objectives, Operating Procedures).
 - B. To Assist a Community to Identify Its Potential for Improvement Through the Use of Natural and Human Resources (Climate, Topography, Number of People, Channels of Communication, Social Agencies, Institutions, Values, and Beliefs).
 - C. To Determine the Educational Services (Including Curriculum, Teacher Activities, etc.) the School Renders and How Such Services are Conditioned by Community Forces.
 - D. To Help to Develop and Implement Plans for the Improvement of Community Life (Amelioration of Race Tensions, Improving Equal Opportunities, Reducing Delinquency, Better Recreational Facilities, etc.).

APPENDIX E (continued)

- E. To Determine and Render Services Which the School Can Best Provide in Community Improvement With and Through the Cooperation of Other Agencies.
- F. To Make Possible the Continual Reexamination of Accepted Plans and Policies for Community Improvement With Particular Reference to the Services Which the Schools are Rendering.

IV. STAFF PERSONNEL

- A. To Provide for the Formulation of Staff Personnel Policies.
- B. To Provide for the Recruitment of Staff Personnel.
- C. To Select and Assign Staff Personnel.
- D. To Promote the General Welfare of the Staff (Tenure, Retirement, Insurance, Sick Leave, Living Conditions, Morale, etc.).
- E. To Develop a System of Staff Personnel Records.
- F. To Stimulate and Provide Opportunities for Professional Growth of Staff Personnel.

V. SCHOOL PLANT

- A. To Determine the Physical Plant Needs of the Community and the Resources Which Can be Marshalled to Meet Those Needs.
- B. To Develop a Comprehensive Plan for the Orderly Growth and Improvement of School Plant Facilities.
- C. To Initiate and Implement Plans for the Orderly Growth and Improvement of School Plant Facilities.
- D. To Develop an Efficient Program of Operation and Maintenance of the Physical Plant.

APPENDIX E (continued)

VI. SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION

- A. To Determine School Transportation Needs and Conditions (Roads, Location of Schools, etc.) Under Which Transportation Services Must be Rendered.
- B. To Procure Equipment and Supplies Through Approved Methods of Purchase and Contract.
- C. To Organize and Provide an Efficient System of School Transportation Maintenance.
- D. To Provide for the Safety of Pupils, Personnel, and Equipment.
- E. To Develop an Understanding and Use of the Legal Provisions Under Which the Transportation System Operates.

VII. ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE

- A. To Establish Working Relationships With Local, State and Federal Agencies to Provide Services Needed by the School System.
- B. To Work With the Board of Education in the Formulation of Public School Policy and Plans.
- C. To Designate Appropriate Operational Units Within the School System (Including Sizes of Schools by Grades, Attendance Areas, etc.).
- D. To Develop a Staff Organization as a Means of Implementing the Educational Planning and Other Educational Activities.
- E. To Organize Lay and Professional Groups for Participation in Educational Planning and Other Educational Activities.

VIII. SCHOOL FINANCE AND BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

- A. To Organize the Business Staff.
- B. To Determine Sources of School Revenues.
- C. To Formulate a Salary Schedule.

APPENDIX E (continued)

- D. To Prepare the School Budget.
- E. To Administer Capital Outlay and Debt Service.
- F. To Administer School Purchasing.
- G. To Account for School Monies.
- H. To Account for School Property (Buildings, Equipment, Buses, etc.).
- I. To Provide for a School Insurance Program.
- J. To Provide a System of Internal Accounting.